ABSTRACT

Laurie Watlington Manning, NCAA ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' SELF-PERSPECTIVE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL/TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP (Under the direction of Dr. Michael Poock). Department of Educational Leadership, May 2012.

The purpose of this study was to examine NCAA athletic directors' (ADs') perceptions of their own leadership styles as they relate to the five dimensions of transformational leadership and the three dimensions of transactional leadership. The research instrument was the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) with added demographic questions. In addition to the determination of the self-perceived athletic director leadership style, the intention of this study was to determine the possible relationship of demographic and institutional variables including athletic director NCAA Division, age, and gender. Participants were the athletic directors from NCAA Division I, II, and III member higher education institutions.

The data were analyzed with descriptive statistics, t-tests, and one-way ANOVAs to examine the research question. The results found significant differences among the institutional variable of NCAA Divisions. A one-way ANOVA demonstrated that transformational leadership traits of intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation set Division I ADs apart from ADs within Divisions II and III. The findings of the study may have significance for intercollegiate ADs in offering an increase in the understanding of their own leadership style. Thus, the AD can move between both transformational and transactional leadership traits depending on a specific task. The findings of the study may also provide a benefit for college and university presidents by hiring and increasing retention of ADs through matching leadership style with the needs and mission of the intercollegiate athletic department.

NCAA ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' SELF-PERSPECTIVE OF

TRANSFORMATIONAL/TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Laurie Watlington Manning

May, 2012

NCAA ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' SELF-PERSPECTIVE OF

TRANSFORMATIONAL/TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

by

Laurie Watlington Manning

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF DISSERTATION_____

Michael Poock

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____

Crystal Chambers

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____

Cheryl McFadden

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____

Sandra Seay

INTERIM CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

_____

William Rouse, Jr.

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL:

_____

Paul Gemperline

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While the dissertation names me as the author, I realize that a team provided pivotal guidance and encouragement throughout the journey. For it is the support, encouragement, and sacrifices of many individuals that allow the dreams of one individual to come true. Throughout my journey, there have been many who have supported and sacrificed so that I could realize my full potential and contribute in some small way to the field of higher education.

I am grateful for having the opportunity to work with supportive faculty members on this dissertation.

To Dr. Michael Poock, a sincere thank you. Throughout the entire program, you have been a true testament of how to treat college students – always supportive, caring, and teaching me how to be a better research and methodology writer. I also appreciate you talking to me to help me pull through the difficult times of this dissertation process. You are an inspiration as I continue my future endeavors in higher education.

Dr. Crystal Chambers, thank you for your wisdom, patience, and knowledge during this difficult yet rewarding research project. I greatly appreciate your editing comments.

Dr. Cheryl McFadden, thank you for your support and guidance in being a better research writer. Your comments directly reflected your desire to encourage me in not only writing, but in speaking and displaying confidence in my work.   I have learned a lot and know that I will make a strong contribution to my future career in higher education because of it.

Dr. Sandra Seay, with your sincere compassion for me as a person and student, you served as a role model on how all college level students should be treated. As I continue my career in higher education, I will remember the example that you have set, as I have the opportunity to interact with students.

Mom and dad, you gave me the greatest gift in life, the belief in myself. With that foundation, your words of encouragement, and your support, I wouldn't be where I am today.

My children, Brooke, Gini, Will, and Jessi, you gave me constant love and support, as you often heard the words, "mommy has to do school work tonight." Your late night hugs and kisses pulled me through many nights.

My family and friends: Ellen and Joe, You have encouraged me throughout this entire program including many rough patches along the way. I could not have accomplished this goal without you. Jane, thank you for taking the time to share your expertise and help me in the editing process. Leisa, Emily, and Sarah, thank you for all your words of encouragement. Mickey, thank you for pulling me through the last year by both the guilt trips when I was burned out and wanted to procrastinate and helping me to relax and realize, "It is almost over!"

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my children: Brooke, Gini, Will, and Jessi.

Your unconditional love kept me going and served as my focus and perspective of the TRULY

IMPORTANT things in life. May you always know and cherish the value of perseverance and

education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Joe Paterno, legendary Penn State coach, holders of the record for the most wins in college football, known as a man of moral character, a true leader, a man to be admired, respected and emulated — was fired. Douthat (2011) highlights that Paterno was not fired for his inability to coach, but was fired for his lack of leadership, negligence, and his compliance and unspoken approval of one of the most dreadful crimes - child molestation. According to Rozner (2011), it took over 13 years, between the 1998 incident and the November 2011 arrest, for someone to finally take action concerning the allegations that Penn State assistant football coach Jerry Sandusky had committed crimes of sexual abuse. Tim Curley, Penn State athletic director (AD) has stepped down from his position and was charged with perjury and not taking appropriate action when the situation was brought to his attention in 2002. When National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) president Mark Emmitt commented on this horrific scandal, he expressed his concern that all faculty, administrators and staff must understand that their main responsibilities were to provide leadership, to be a mentor, and to maintain a high ethical standard. Since 1989 the Knight Commission has worked to ensure that intercollegiate athletic programs operated within institutional standards and parameters set by the NCAA in order to uphold the educational mission of the college or university (Knight Commission, 1991). In response to the moral and criminal problems at Penn State, the Knight Commission put pressure on the NCAA to make policy changes to prevent similar instances from occurring in the future.

In a recent poll conducted by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, Americans indicated that they were troubled by the conduct of intercollegiate athletes and were deeply concerned about the professionalization of college sports (Knight Commission, 2009).

The poll also indicated the need for stronger leadership within intercollegiate athletics since these athletic programs received larger and larger amounts of public and private funding. The concomitant level of media exposure as well as the high visibility of scandals also added to American concerns.

Leadership in intercollegiate athletics at the institutional level began with the AD. In some respects, AD duties can be bifurcated along the lines of the research and literature on leadership. According to Bass (1985), two leadership styles, transformational and transactional, dominate contemporary research. For certain, all ADs had transactional tasks. For example, the AD was tied into every aspect of the athletic department like academics, budgetary needs, and disciplinary actions (Choi, Sagas, Park, & Cunningham, 2007). As such, the director of athletics had to have had a good administrative staff and dedicated coaches to keep the program running smoothly.

Yet the AD role seemed more than just transactional duties. Research into leadership suggested that the manner in which visions and the ability to articulate them can and did differ. The head of athletics position was often a very prominent and powerful position, particularly at the intercollegiate level, with a great deal of responsibility involved with managing the athletic function of each sport team in the athletic department. As evolved from nineteenth-century origins in student-organized and administered endeavors (Andre & James, 1991), intercollegiate athletics became a massive complex phenomenon where student welfare, complex financial and business conditions, public and media relations, and philanthropy merged to define managerial leadership responsibilities (Fizel & Fort, 2004) and the influence of an AD. Acosta and Carpenter (2004) said, "Their experience, decision-making style, and their commitment concerning equity often have an impact upon the vision and goals of the program they administer

2

and the people they hire" (p. 6). Moreover, the pressure to win by school boards, administration, and alumni placed enormous pressure on ADs to appoint a head coach who could win, for some at any cost. If the staff did not reach this expectation, they were replaced (Watkins & Rikard, 1991). Therefore, the importance of ethical leadership within intercollegiate athletics was of major concern within higher education administration. Clearly, an AD needed a range of skills and abilities in order to balance the complexities and interactions that emerged from concerns with educational, athletic, public, and organizational components of effective administration. The role of an AD, therefore, was more than transactional and called for transformative skills to lead and direct athletic organizations towards a broad vision and set of goals, well beyond a few students kicking around a ball.

AD's were the focus of this study for two reasons: college athletics were a major aspect of both our culture and our economy. Peachey and Burton (2011) stressed the importance of a clear understanding that educational institutions and athletic departments within them were faced with financial complexities. Suggs (2004b) suggested that the financial strain increased the demands placed upon university administrators and ADs to attend to organizational factors that had little to do with either education or athletics. The financial and aggressive pressures that college sports programs helped to create were smashing together with a harsh economy that, in some situations, left colleges under pressure to fill stadiums (Peachey & Burton, 2011). Within these intercollegiate athletic programs, increasing desperation to keep the revenue flowing led them to create ties with a new generation of savvy entrepreneurs who have sports-management degrees and made a specialty of increasingly aggressive marketing to devoted fans of college sports.

Despite the significant amount of research concerning leadership in higher education

administration, very little research was conducted to examine leadership style in intercollegiate athletic programs. This was unfortunate as Fizel and Fort (2004) argued that the multidimensional responsibilities undertaken by NCAA ADs were not only of great importance within higher education, but also constituted a broader base of challenges than one typically found in other areas of higher education administration – including presidents, chancellors, and members of their cabinet (Aguirre & Martinez, 2002; Paternoster, 2006; Woods, 2007).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation research study was to examine NCAA ADs perceptions of their own leadership style as it related to the five dimensions of transformational leadership: (a) idealized influence – attributes, (b) idealized influence – behaviors, (c) intellectual stimulation, (d) inspirational motivation, and (e) individualized consideration; and the three dimensions of transactional leadership: (a) contingent reward, (b) management by exception – active, and (c) management by exception – passive, assessing the variance in leadership style by NCAA division and the demographic characteristics of age and gender. These dimensions will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 2. I measured AD leadership styles using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which is discussed further in chapter 3.

In order to begin to examine leadership within the intercollegiate athletic department, it was important for the AD to self-reflect on his/her own leadership style. Leaders needed to spend time looking inward and to discover more about themselves. Consequently, this exercise allowed them the opportunity to reflect on insights about what made them stand out to others and to develop a more effective leadership style. For research purposes, this study examined AD self-perceptions.

Along the dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership as well as

demographic and institutional factors of ADs in NCAA programs was of scholarly importance. This purpose was derived from relevant past research that looked at leadership styles of higher education administrators. According to Burton and Peachey (2009), there had been a lack of research in the area of intercollegiate athletic administration in comparison to other university administrators. On the other hand, Peachey and Burton (2011) emphasized that with the increasing budgets in the area of athletics, there was an escalating importance of administration and leadership in this area.

More specifically, the study included four major goals. First, the researcher investigated intercollegiate AD's perceptions regarding transformational / transactional leadership style. Second, the researcher sought to determine if relationships existed among the ADs' perceptions of transformational / transactional leadership style in terms of one institutional variable, the NCAA Division of which the ADs' institution was a member. Third, the researcher sought to determine if relationships existed among the ADs' perceptions of their transformational / transactional leadership in terms of two demographic questions that included the age and gender of the AD. Participants in this study were ADs from NCAA Division I, II, and III member higher education institutions.

Significance of the Study

The Penn State scandal was just one of many involving powerful higher education institutions, including The University of Miami's football program that was under investigation for allegations of paying student athletes for their success on the football field. In some of these cases, according to Douthat (2011), it was found that immoral and illegal behavior was not reported by athletic administrators in order to protect the school's reputation and legacy, its moneymaking and prestige-enhancing athletics program, as well as to hide bad judgments by

university administrators, defuse material witnesses, and protect perpetrators. Douthat (2011) explained that by demanding new leadership of the university and the football team, the Penn State Board of Trustees set an example for higher standards of responsibility and accountability for its top leaders. As intercollegiate athletics experienced increasingly multifaceted internal and external environmental changes with high visibility, ADs needed to provide truly effective leadership that could bring extraordinary organizational outcomes by successfully leading the organization and followers (Doherty & Danylchuck, 1996; Geist, 2001). Aguirre and Martinez (2002) believed that the first and overriding responsibility of anyone who purports to manage was to manage self. This study examined the NCAA ADs' self-perception of their leadership style and the degree to which they were more or less transformational and transactional.

The findings from this study provided more awareness and attention to NCAA ADs' perceptions of their own leadership style in regards to being more or less transformational and more or less transactional. The study allowed university administrators to better identify different leadership approaches and styles in an era of accountability. The AD could theoretically adopt a leadership approach and style that had a stronger relationship with specific demographic variables, thereby potentially increasing the strength of the existing relationships. The findings of the study also provided a benefit for ADs examining alternative leadership methods to motivate coaches and student-athletes to maintain high moral standards and uphold the educational mission of the college or university.

Such insights were beneficial to higher education institution administrators as they considered expanding intercollegiate athletic programs with the focus on establishing leadership within the program that would bring high standards to the university. Furthermore, a need to contribute to the body of knowledge regarding intercollegiate ADs and their position as an

6

administrator within the university was important due to the limited data available. The findings from this study allowed intercollegiate ADs the opportunity to better understand the perceptions of their peers in regards to leadership style within intercollegiate athletic programs. This newly acquired knowledge base provided the foundation of continued implementation and reorganization of intercollegiate athletic programs as a means of increasing the integrity and standards of athletic programs through effective leadership.

Athletic programs in NCAA colleges and universities faced a daunting task in dealing with complexities which emerged from trying to balance traditional values like student welfare and competitiveness with practical challenges arising from areas like law, finance, public relations, media relations, television contracts, and personnel (Kuchler, 2001; Pederson & Whisenant, 2005; Scott, 1999). In any organization, leadership competencies were a fundamental driving force for effectiveness, and studies like Geist (2001) and Scott (1999) addressed these broad issues in the context of NCAA athletic programs. The leadership styles of ADs as university administrators were certainly a likely influence over the success of athletic programs (Ryska, 2002).

This study contributed to an ongoing stream of research literature oriented toward the relationship between leadership style and athletic administration in NCAA colleges and universities. Burton and Peachey (2009) suggested that further research be performed to further examine the relationship of transformational and transactional leadership to intercollegiate athletics. The unique contribution of this study was to examine the relationship between AD's self-evaluations of their own leadership style (as measured by the MLQ) rather than the perceptions of others about AD's leadership styles as that self-evaluation related to three factors – NCAA division classification, age, and gender.

Leadership Style

Leadership style was the primary variable of interest in this study. By way of definition, leadership can be described in many different ways. According to Northouse (2001), "leadership is defined as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal" (p. 3). He explained that leadership was a process to imply that a leader affected, and was affected, by the followers and organizational constraints. Historically, there have been many approaches to the study of leadership style, among them, democratic versus autocratic styles, task versus relationship-oriented styles, and consideration versus initiation approaches to activities and ideas (Bass, 1990).

Burns (1978) makes a central distinction between what he calls "transactional" and "transforming" leadership. He believed that transactional leadership occurred when one person took the initiative and made contact with others for the purpose of a trade for valued things. Burns (1978) described this type of leadership as the politics of exchange. Furthermore, he saw transactional and transformational as mutually exclusive leadership styles.

However, the concept of transformational leadership has developed over time. The "sense" of transformational leadership was expressed well by leadership and organization theorists such as Bennis (1985), Burns (1978), and Greenleaf and Spears (1977). Downton (1973) was documented as one of the first to coin the phrase "transformational leadership." Burns (1978) followed with a focus on differences in transformational and transactional leadership styles in the political arena. He captured the broadest sense of transformational leadership when he stated:

"Essentially the leader's task is consciousness-raising on a wide plane. …The leader's fundamental act is to induce people to be aware or conscious of what they feel -- to feel

8

their true needs so strongly, to define their values so meaningfully, that they can be

moved to purposeful action" (Burns, 1978, pp. 43-44).

Bass (1985) provided evidence that leaders could demonstrate both styles, and the choice was a

function of situational factors. Bass (1990) defined transformational leadership as leadership

that motivated and inspired the followers' ideals and moral values so that performance was more

effective. Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino (1990) noted that transformational leadership could

be understood as an extension of certain attributes typically associated with transactional

leadership.

Bass (1985) provided evidence that transactional and transformational created a

continuum of leadership rather than two separate and distinct styles. Avolio and Bass (2004)

further described the connection between these two leadership styles as a leader who recognized

the transactional needs in perspective followers but was inclined to go further, seeking to

stimulate and fulfill higher needs, to absorb the entire character of the follower to a higher stage

of need according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Through two decades of work, leadership

theorists came to the perspective that maintaining the status quo was no longer a viable option,

which was, "management researchers suddenly became very interested in charismatic leadership

and the transformation and revitalization of organizations" (Yukl, 1989, p. 269).

The conceptual dimensions of leadership as measured by the MLQ formed the basis for

hypotheses in this study. The first five of these dimensions: (a) idealized influence – attributes,

(b) idealized influence – behaviors, (c) intellectual stimulation, (d) inspirational motivation, and

(e) individual consideration related positively to transformational leadership characteristics, and

the remaining three: (a) contingent reward, (b) management by exception – active, and (c)

management by exception related positively to a transactional leadership style, which was

somewhat antithetical to transformational leadership. These eight dimensions were tested for their associations with the variables of interest – NCAA Division category, age and gender.

Athletic Administration, Leadership Style and Demographics

Leadership style, gender differences, and to a lesser extent age were major concerns of an emerging literature in athletic administration (Burton & Peachey, 2009; Choi, Sagas, Park, & Cunningham, 2007; Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996; Peachey & Burton, 2011). An interesting organizational (rather than personal) demographic had to do with the three divisions of the NCAA. The size and scope of operations between the elite Division I football programs (major conferences) and Division III programs differed dramatically. These differences had been comprehensively documented within the NCAA (2011). Peachey and Burton (2011) and Burton and Peachey (2009) examined transformational leadership and how its implications differed across NCAA Divisions, and found little evidence of such differences. However, as has been well established in the contingency theory of organizations literature (Burns, Stalker, Lawrence, & Lorsch, 2011), competence in leadership was contingent upon the internal and external environmental contingencies that defined an organization's context. Certainly, the scope of differences across NCAA divisions was productive of such contingencies (Robinson, Tedrick, & Carpenter, 2001). For that reason, this study tested for different associations between leadership style and NCAA categories (Divisions I, II, and III). It may well be that AD's self-reported responses indicate significant differences in the extent to which AD's understood themselves as transformational.

Age related to leadership style, particularly on the dimension of idealized influence, although there were remarkable similarities in leadership style across older and younger leaders (Kabacoff & Stoffey, 2001; Oshagbemi, 2004). The importance of research concerning the

10

relationship between leadership and age was underscored in the findings by Kakabadse et al. (1998) that age along with other time related dimensions, had a profound effect on shaping the attitudes and behaviors of senior administration within organizations. In addition, Kabacoff and Stoffey (2001) specified that there was an assumption that the generational differences among organizational members had an impact on leader behavior, which affected both individual and organizational results. In the context of athletic administration, Doherty (1997) found that older ADs were perceived by their coaches to use passive management-by-exception significantly more than younger ADs and that younger ADs were perceived by their coaches to demonstrate all five of the transformational leadership dimensions significantly more often than did older ADs. These studies added to this literature by examining whether AD's self-reports about leadership style were associated with age differences.

Gender differences had received far more attention than any other demographic category in the leadership style literature. Nevertheless, there had been a continuing debate in the management literature over the past two decades as to whether female and male managers use different leadership styles. Through the early 1990s, a growing body of research emerged that concluded there were no gender differences in leadership styles. Numerous recognized leadership researchers including Powell (1993) and Bass (1981) supported this principle. However, following the publication of a Harvard Business Review article, "Ways Women Lead", the formerly reached conclusion of no gender differences in leadership styles was called into question (Rosener, 1990). Bass (1996), who had previously been a strong supporter for no female-male differences in leadership styles, started to question his previous conclusions. The evidence on gender and leadership style was not conclusive (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Grant, 1988; Loden, 1985; Rosener, 1990).

From previous studies, generally, female leaders tended to be viewed by others as, on average, more transformational than men. Eagly and Johnson (1990) reviewed 162 studies that yielded comparisons of women and men on relevant measures. Women, more than men, manifested relatively interpersonally oriented and democratic styles, and men, more than women, manifested relatively task- oriented and autocratic styles. However, Peachey and Burton (2011) found that ADs had a set of characteristics that set them apart from other leaders and that gender did not seem to be associated with other peoples' perceptions of the leadership style of ADs. In contrast to Peachey and Burton's concern with how others view the leadership styles of AD's, this study examined the self-perceptions of AD's and how those perceptions may or may not be associated with gender differences.

There had been no evidence that indicated any significant difference in leadership style as a function of race (Avolio & Bass, 2004). In a recent study of NCAA Division II and I AD's by Burton & Peachey (2011), the participants were 97% White Caucasian, therefore, the findings would have been inconclusive with respect to race. Given that this study contained the same population as the Peachy and Burton (2011) study and therefore, would have included an insignificant number of minorities, race was omitted as a demographic in this study.

Summary of Methodology, Research Design and Conceptual Framework

This study was unique in that it addressed the AD leadership style as measured directly through AD self-reports on the MLQ instrument. ADs from all NCAA member-schools were surveyed through email. Survey responses were used to (1) classify the leadership style of the AD; (2) test for significant differences between self-perceived leadership style of AD's and the NCAA division in which their athletic program was a member; and (3) test for significant differences between perceived leadership style and the AD's age and gender. This study was

based on the eight dimensions of leadership presented in Bass's (1985) model of transformational and transactional leadership. In order to accomplish the specified purpose, the following research method was employed in the study.

Sample and Survey Instrument

The sample of the study was drawn from the population of 1079 ADs across all divisions of the NCAA. The survey was web-based and administered through Mind Garden, a private publishing company that held exclusive rights to administration of the MLQ. The survey included the MLQ and a section of demographic questions. Subject responses were scored according to the dimensions of both transformational and transactional leadership. The transformational dimensions consisted of idealized influence (attributes), idealized influence (behaviors), intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration. The transactional dimensions included contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception.

Data Analysis

The MLQ was used to examine the association between dimensions of leadership style, NCAA Division classification, age, and gender. The dependent variables of transformational leadership in the study included: Idealized Influence - Attributes (IIa), Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), Inspirational Motivation (IM), and Individual Consideration (IC). The dependent variables that consisted of dimensions of transactional leadership were Contingent Reward (CR), Active Management by Exception (AME), and Passive Management by Exception (PME). The above stated dimensions were the dependent variables and were investigated as functions of one institutional independent variable and two demographic independent variables, including NCAA Division, age, and gender. A more

thorough discussion of survey, sampling, and design aspects of the study were provided in chapter 3.

Research Questions

There was one overarching research question that was tested in this study. The research question explored in this study considered to what degree NCAA ADs' perceived themselves to demonstrate more or less transformational and transactional leadership dimensions. The self-perception of the AD leadership style was assessed utilizing the MLQ and analysis was based upon the five dimensions of transformational leadership and the three dimensions of transactional leadership. In addition to this overarching research question, there were three sub-research questions that were examined.

The first sub-research question studied, considered to what degree, if any, the NCAA division category of the AD created a significant difference in the self-perception of their leadership style as it specifically related to the eight dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership. Utilizing the Multivariate Leadership Questionnaire assessed the self-perception of the AD leadership style. The NCAA division of the AD was assessed through demographic questions that were added to the online survey. The second sub-research question considered to what degree if any the age of the AD created a significant difference in the self-perception of their leadership style as it specifically related to the eight dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership. The self-perception of the AD leadership style was assessed utilizing the Multivariate Leadership Questionnaire. The age of the NCAA AD was assessed through an institutional question that was added to the online survey. The third sub-research question considered to what degree if any the gender of the AD created a significant difference in the self-perception of their leadership style as it specifically related to the eight

dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership. In all, 24 hypotheses were used to structure this inquiry. They were listed in detail in chapter 3.

Definitions of Terms

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ): A multifactor questionnaire designed to measure a broad range of leadership constructs, related to transformational, transactional, and passive avoidant leadership styles (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA): The dominant governing organization in U.S. intercollegiate athletics was headquartered at Indianapolis, ID. It functioned as a general legislative and administrative authority, communicating and enforcing rules of play for various sports and eligibility standards for athletes. The NCAA stratifies member programs into three divisions based on the scope and range of athletic programs (Division I, II, and III).

Athletic directors (AD): Athletic directors were the individuals responsible for managing the athletic programs of NCAA colleges and universities. Duties of athletics directors include scheduling, appointing, supervising, training and evaluating, budgeting, and fund and facility management (Geist, 2001).

Leader: A leader was defined as a person who was in a position to potentially inspire confidence and support among the people needed to achieve organizational goals (Day, 2000; Hernez-Broome & Hughes, 2004).

Leadership: Leadership was a development whereby an individual influenced a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2001).

Transformational leadership: Transformational leadership motivated individuals to perform beyond normal expectations by inspiring subordinates to pursue higher order goals by a

15

higher commitment to ideals and values instead of self-interest in order to benefit the organization (Bono & Judge, 2004).

Transactional leadership: Transactional leader depended primarily upon incentives and rewards in order to motivate others to achieve desired outcomes (Bono & Judge, 2004).

Five Dimensions of Transformational Leadership: These included idealized influence – attributes, idealized influence – behaviors, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individual consideration.

Three Dimensions of Transactional Leadership: These were contingent reward, management-by-exception - active; and management by exception - passive. (Each of these terms was previously defined in this chapter) (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Limitations of the Study

The MLQ was in its third edition and had been evolving over the past 25 years. The proposed study was limited in that the MLQ was self-reported and based on personal perception. Therefore, it could not directly measure leadership since it was based on the AD's perception, and followers of the AD were not surveyed (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The population of NCAA ADs used in this study presented a limitation to this study dealing with gender. The numbers of female ADs within the NCAA were considerably smaller than the male population. This was especially true in NCAA Division I in which females hold less than 5% of the AD positions (NCAA, 2011).

Summary

The administration of college and university athletics and the question of its place and importance within the university culture, taken as a whole, had been debated even before the inception of the NCAA. Throughout almost a century of intercollegiate athletics governed by

the NCAA, there were many factors that contributed to the economic expansion of intercollegiate sports (Suggs, 2004a). As rapidly as revenues and competition for media grew for NCAA members and conferences, the focus of intercollegiate athletics shifted, greatly accelerating the growth of intercollegiate athletics over the past three decades. The history, culture and economic success of the university athletic program played a pivotal role in the explanation of these disparities. Major changes in society and higher education significantly affected the administrative responsibilities of intercollegiate athletic administration. The problems associated with the big business of intercollegiate sports suggested a need for more effective leadership.

Through the exploration of transformational leadership characteristics of ADs, this research could (a) contribute to the body of scholarly research devoted to athletic research, (b) increase the knowledge base of other colleges and universities, with regard to effective leadership styles, and (c) create greater understanding of the role of ADs within intercollegiate athletics. In spite of the large, accumulated body of literature on transformational leadership in the area of higher education administration, the topic had been given remarkably little attention in the literature related to intercollegiate athletic administration. The studies that included research that connected leadership with intercollegiate athletic administration generally involved job satisfaction, university president's role, or coaches' perspectives of AD leadership style. This study's primary focus was on the self-perceived leadership style of ADs and the relation to NCAA divisional demands and responsibilities.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter introduces the reader to literature that was related to leadership within intercollegiate athletics. A review of the theoretical and empirical research literature was conducted to explore the development and validity of transformational and transactional leadership theory and research. More explicitly, the literature was reviewed to investigate the emergence of transformational / transactional leadership as a distinct theory. Also, the literature was examined to determine how the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership developed by Bass (1985) were considered under the framework of intercollegiate athletic administration, specifically athletic directors (ADs). Finally, this chapter examined literature that was related to the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership style and the three demographics of interest in this study -- NCAA Division, age, and gender.

Background of Intercollegiate Athletics

Intercollegiate athletics has become an integral part of the culture of higher education in the United States (Fulks, 2003; Goff, 2000; Suggs, 2004c). Today, higher education administrators have to be more flexible, more nimble, and more proficient than ever before. According to Suggs (2004b), ADs not only need to be involved in the daily activities of their department, but they must effectively provide vision that will lead, inspire, and motivate a wide range of stakeholders with varying needs and demands. In order to recognize the significance of the athletic department administrative structure and the function of the AD, it was important to understand when and how intercollegiate athletics became incorporated into the university culture.

Sports competition has accompanied the expansion and development of American colleges and universities since the start of the century with such consistency and intensity that we could not complete our understanding of higher education in America without understanding intercollegiate athletics. According to Choi, Sagas, Park, and Cunningham (2007), the establishment of the Morrill Act of 1862 was one of the most momentous occurrences in the expansion of higher education. This act established the land-grant college, allowing for each institution 150,000 acres of land for agricultural and mechanical purposes. The authors stated that the rationale of the land-grant school was to meet the educational needs of the students and to directly enhance and benefit the community. As the mission and purpose of higher education was being redefined, intercollegiate athletics provided a sense of unity and spirit for fragmented campuses while also serving as a means for raising money and increasing enrollments (McCormick & Tinsley, 1988; Scott, 1997; Sheehan, 2000).

The first intercollegiate athletic competition was a boat race between Harvard and Yale in 1852. Subsequently, other intercollegiate sports began to materialize in American culture. College and university athletic programs began to become more involved than merely placing two teams together for competition. According to Grimes and Chressanthins (1994), determining eligibility requirements for competition and developing rules of play were among several of the first issues realized by college sport administrators. In its initial development, intercollegiate athletics was administered by students and student-run associations (Grimes & Chressanthins, 1994; Sigelman & Bookheimer, 1983; Thelin, 2004). However, college and university athletics quickly grew beyond the administrative capacity of college students. This allowed for the formalization of administrative controls and agencies to regulate intercollegiate athletic programs (Sigelman & Bookheimer 1983).

The economic and financial significance of NCAA athletics came to a pivotal point in the Supreme Court's 1984 decision in *NCAA v Bd. of Regents of the University of Oklahoma,* 468 U.S. 85 (1984). The Court ruled that NCAA rules governing the number of times a school's football team could appear on television under contracts negotiated solely by the NCAA were an illegal control and limitation of trade under section 1 of the Sherman Act. Suggs (2003b) described the implications by suggesting that this instantly prevented the NCAA from governing the activities of individual members or conferences in the promotion and sale of their athletic entertainment product. This decision enabled colleges and universities to engage in their own broadcast contracts, enabling them to make millions of dollars. According to Suggs (2004d), it allowed for economic competition into college sports, making money an important and vital factor with the games on the field. This, of course, made economics and finance a salient feature of athletic administration and leadership.

The court's decision in the University of Oklahoma case could not have come at a better time for the emerging cable enterprise. According to Suggs (2005), cable was just gaining a grip into the American households, and ESPN and other channels greatly needed programming. Championship tournament basketball was a good example, and Devanna and Tichy (1990) pointed out that until the mid-1980s, conferences sent only one team to the Division I men's basketball tournament per year, a far cry from the financially driven scope of that tournament today. Similarly, football bowl games expanded greatly. Suggs (2004a) emphasized that prior to the 1980s a small number of bowl games involved very few football teams.

According to Suggs (2003a), the expansion of media coverage came at a time when athletics departments needed new sources of income to finance legally mandated expansion into non-revenue-generating sports. Roberts (2004) suggested that passage of Title IX of the

Education Amendments of 1972 and the NCAA's 1981 decision to begin holding women's championships had forced colleges to add an assortment of teams for women, and those teams needed money to operate. Raiborn (1990) stated that these decisions also led to a greater concentration on basketball for the NCAA. After 1984, according to Suggs (2003a), the College Football Association took over the NCAA's role in orchestrating television appearances for football teams at most of the country's elite sports conferences. The NCAA, for its part, was essentially shut out of the business side of football. Frank (2004) contended that the association received a legal opinion two years after the Supreme Court's decision saying that it could not exercise any control over postseason bowl games either, leaving conferences free to make deals with bowls and television networks for their teams.

In the 1990s, according to Suggs (2004c), college sports without a doubt came into its own as "big business". He continued to explain that television networks began entering into contracts worth billions of dollars for the rights to men's football and basketball games played by star colleges in star conferences with star athletes. Suggs (2004b) explained that the Atlantic Coast Conference contracted for a seven-year, $260 million deal with ABC and ESPN to broadcast the league's football games. The Big 12 Conference had a single year distribution of $101-million in bowl-game revenue, broadcast royalties, and NCAA payouts to its members, and the SEC distributed $103-million in a single year to its twelve members. Fulks (2003) pointed out that the large amount of income produced through successful football and basketball programs did not suggest that the overall athletic department of these schools was producing a profit. Expenses increased dramatically as well. Revenues from media-intensive sports (football and basketball) were used in many cases to cover losses in other sport programs within the athletic department.

21

The escalating costs of maintaining a quality intercollegiate athletics program threatened the sustainability of programs at some colleges and universities, a rather ironic outcome when one considered the economic reasons for the growth of college sports in the early 1900s. Colleges and universities of the late 19th and early 20th century decided to emphasize their sports programs because of the revenue potential and the enhancements provided to campus recruiting at a time when enrollments were down. However, since the late 1990s, colleges and universities have been through a "managerial revolution", as they endeavored to satisfy stakeholders and close the financial gap between state appropriations and institutional expenses (Altbach, 2006). According to Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder (2009), many colleges and universities imposed double-digit tuition increases to compensate for reduced state appropriations. Suggs (2003a) further explained that the impact of these economic factors forced universities to reassess their athletics departments, sometimes resulting in the elimination of programs. He continued by stating that decreased state support, tuition increases and demands for accountability were forcing institutions of higher education towards restructuring themselves, mainly by either turning their non-academic units into auxiliary enterprises, or by outsourcing those units. Altbach (2006) contended that intercollegiate athletics, as a very prominent part of most institutions, had been and continued to be deeply affected by the overall higher education financial scenario. As the department responsible for athletics and a microcosm of the institution, the athletic department was exposed to the same accountability and financial pressures as the institution it belonged to (Burden & Li, 2003; Burns, Stalker, Lawrence, & Lorsch, 2011). Thus, athletic departments must take appropriate measures to demonstrate accountability and seek self-sufficiency.

The discussion of the economics and finances associated with NCAA athletics raised interesting questions about leadership style. According to Burns, Stalker, Lawrence, and Lorsch (2011) the benefits of transformational styles were essential at a time of rampant change and innovation. Conversely, financial management, also a vital and beneficial component of athletic administration, seemed to appeal to a transactional style oriented toward control and obvious processes of accountability. To this end, as discussed below through related literature, effective athletic administration perhaps required leaders who were able to apply both leadership styles as the situation demanded.

Role of the Athletic Director

As athletic programs evolved so did the role of leadership within them. A time of major change occurred from 1980 to 2010, when the typical athletic programs went from being directed by volunteer students to full-time ADs and coaching professionals paid from student fees (Thelin, 2004). Burton and Peachey (2009) agreed that intercollegiate ADs and their association with leadership style had been researched over the past two decades as a result of the dynamic changes in the global economy and the information age. In spite of this, there was still a lack of research in athletic administration. Over the years, the position grew into a rich context of complex professionalism. As the position of an AD became a professional position in the early twentieth century, the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA, 2009) organization was founded in 1965 to promote and further develop the role of an intercollegiate AD. In 2009, membership included more than 6,100 collegiate athletics administrators from all levels (NACDA, 2009).

Management / Finance Role

As the roles and demands of AD's became more vital to the overall university administration, the search criteria and hiring targeted more financial- and business-oriented individuals. According to a research survey, Grimes and Chressanthins (1994) found that the most common desired traits and characteristics of Division I ADs were the following:

1. Strategic Planning – the ability to evaluate, develop, and implement goals and plans

2. Understanding of gender equity issues and regulatory procedures

3. Ability to manage complex financial issues and budgets

4. Capability to lead a large and diverse staff

5. Marketing expertise

6. Public speaking and media relation skills

7. Creativity and problem solving abilities

The AD was directly responsible for the entire athletic department, which in most cases was treated much like a separate entity from the college or university in regards to management and finance. Financial resources were essential to the functioning of an athletic department. As ticket sales, money allocated from the overall institutional budget, and other revenue streams were often not enough to sustain the operation of the athletic department, fundraising from individuals and other private entities was vital to the economic well being of the athletic department. Yow, Migliore, Bowden, Stevens, and Loudon (2000) illustrated the athletic department's goals, needs, and objectives for fundraising. They defined the purpose and need for fundraising within athletic departments: "… there is a more practical reason for including a specific statement about fundraising; it forces the planner to estimate the resources needed to underwrite specific programs and operation" (Yow et al., 2000, p. 56). According to Scott

(1999), fundraising was the second largest revenue source for the majority of NCAA athletic departments, second only to ticket sales.

Scott (1999) highlighted that the administrative role of ADs included numerous managerial tasks and stated that "an effective sport administrator possesses characteristics of both leadership and management" (p. 301). For assessing organizational climate, Scott (1999) used a descriptive approach that captured "shared individual perceptions" (p. 302). Scott (1999) deliberately selected athletic departments representing NCAA Divisions I, II, and III. The condition specified that each intercollegiate athletic department had finished as winners or top five finalists in their respective divisions for the 1995-96 Sears Directors Cup award. The sample consisted of senior AD's and head coaches of core sports from 21 intercollegiate athletic departments. In this study, the researcher used the Leadership Orientations Survey developed by Bolman and Deal (1991). The results, consistent with that of Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999), showed that financial management, leadership, policymaking, disturbance handling, revenue generation, and athlete affairs were professed to be the roles of an intercollegiate AD.

Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999) selected Mintzberg's (1980) model as a framework for examining Canadian intercollegiate AD's. Danylchuk and Chelladurai (1999) extended Mintzberg's (1980) model to evaluate the different aspects of the AD's job. This study resulted in a list of 19 managerial roles. The study consisted of 42 AD's of intercollegiate athletic programs in the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union. The AD's were divided into two categories based on their universities' total enrollment number of sports sponsored by their departments, and years of experience. However, none of these factors affected the importance placed on the managerial roles. The top activities that specified highest priority by the respondents were the following: (a) financial management, (b) leadership, (c) policymaking, (d)

disturbance handling (responding to occurrences beyond one's immediate control), (e) revenue generation, and (f) athlete affairs.

Human Resource Role

King (2005b) considered the hiring of coaches as one of the most important roles of an AD, because athletic departments were comprised of teams, and the purpose of these teams was to be successfully competitive. King (2005b) further explained that the hiring suitable candidates as head coaches who managed the different programs was not only critical to the achievement of the athletic department as a whole but was also critical to the professional success of the individual AD who was accountable for the total success of the department.

Goff (2000) and King (2005b) suggested that effective human resource skills were critical in order to deal with a diverse group of stakeholders. In addition to this list, the role of the AD evolved to include academic goals and defining the bridge between athletic and academic programs. King (2005b) further explained that those in athletic administrative positions were receiving much more training and formal education in the business of sport management than they did in former times. Part of this education included instruction in the styles of leadership.

Academic Role

Collegiate athletics was embedded in an academic environment. Consequently, some believed that the role of the AD should be more educationally oriented (Curry, 1996; Ellis, 2007; Scott, 1999). According to Andre and James (1991), there was a need for ADs to primarily be educators since the ADs held the responsibility of connecting athletics and education. Therefore, they believed that the AD should serve on academic councils, provide student-athletes with orientation programs, develop academic policies and standards for athletes, and maintain

evaluation programs for all athletic participants. In addition, the AD should project an awareness of diversity throughout all athletic programs.

One of the key jobs of the AD was to watch over the academic eligibility of the athletes. Although individual colleges and universities had their own eligibility requirements, the NCAA set standards for intercollegiate student-athletes that were to be maintained. The AD enforced the student-athlete requirements and often implemented proactive academic support programs. Also, the AD often served in cooperation with other departments to supply necessary resources for students to transfer and graduate.

Institutional Responsibility

The Director of Intercollegiate Athletics was responsible for the administration of an athletic program that supported the university mission and long-term goals of success in athletics and academics for student athletes. According to Shulman and Bowen (2001), the AD was responsible to work collaboratively with university administration, students, faculty and staff to oversee the athletic program in compliance with university, state, NCAA and federal rules, regulations and laws. Most ADs from all NCAA divisions reported that they were directly responsible for the important tasks with less important roles being delegated to subordinates including the assistant AD. This was in contrast to shared governance models where faculty members were greater contributors in administrative areas related to teaching and research. Instead, campus administrators relied heavily on the guidance of the athletics personnel, making the role of the AD a very important one of the entire academic institution (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). The findings of the above two studies supported the findings of Bass and Avolio (1993), which recognized that good leadership required elements of both transformational and

27

transactional leadership. In the same way, Scott (1999) concluded that an effective AD was both manager and leader.

Colleges and universities facing transformational change called for decentralization, developed an organizational culture that embraced continuous learning, sustained change efforts, managed the change process, developed change agents, and encouraged individuals as well as structural change in the organization (Massimiliano, 2004). The president of a college or university was generally held responsible for all outcomes pertaining to athletics; however, according to Doherty (1997), the everyday responsibility and authority of maintaining proper control of an institution's athletic department fell upon the AD. In addition, ADs were also typically held responsible for developing and maintaining a keen knowledge and understanding of the rules and legislation of the NCAA based upon the respective division (Doherty & Danylchuk, 1996).

In a study that examined NCAA Division I university presidents' perceptions, as well as, ADs' perceptions of the AD's authority, Seidler, Gerdy, and Cardinal (1998) found that: (a) presidents and ADs had shared authority in operations concerning academic standards and integrity; (b) ADs had major authority in the operations of goals and philosophy, budget and finance, institutional control, and recruiting; (c) AD's had almost total authority in the operations of human resources concerning the athletic department and personnel procedures.

Demographics

Division

Since the scope and complexity of athletics differed dramatically across NCAA Divisions, this study tested whether or not ADs' self-perceptions of their own leadership style differed across those divisions (I, II and III). Peachey and Burton (2011) and Burton and

28

Peachey (2009) examined AD perceptions of hypothetical leaders for association with NCAA

Divisions but find no evidence supportive of a divisional effect. However, it may be that AD's

in different divisions perceive their own style differently, and the results of this study will

provide some initial evidence on whether or not that was in fact the case.

Age

According to Kakabadse, Kakabadse, and Myers (1998) and Paternoster (2006), notions

of masculinity were evident in athletics, where men attempted to divide themselves from and

hold power over women. In fact, Robinson, Tedrick, and Carpenter (2001) contended that

leadership opportunities for women within athletics were virtually nonexistent until the 1970s.

Therefore, studies concerning athletic leadership had differing findings from typical gender and

leadership research. Peachey and Burton (2011) and Burton and Peachey (2009) used vignettes

to evaluate AD's perceptions of leadership style as it related to the operational outcomes

measured in the MLQ. The results of both studies indicated that the gender of the leader did not

influence the perceived outcomes. Thus, the stereotypical leadership behavior that had

predominately been cited throughout transformational – transactional leadership research did not

apply in this study as it related to the role of ADs. The explanation given by Peachey and Burton

(2011) for the insignificant findings was that the characteristics of an AD were distinct from

mainstream business. These characteristics included educational values and student-athlete

focus promoted by the university and the NCAA.

Kabacoff and Stoffey (2001) suggested that the "ability to understand, learn, and

effectively leverage multigenerational diversity will be necessary for organizations now and in

the future to build and maintain high performance systems" (p. 2). Despite this need, in

comparison to other demographics, age was greatly underrepresented in the context of leadership

29

style research. The age variable of this study was in response to Oshagbeni (2004) who suggested that there was a need for additional research of the leadership styles and behavior in the context of demographic components including age of organizational leaders. Choi (2007) suggested that age tended to be associated with individualism with the younger generations feeling more comfortable demonstrating individualistic behaviors.

Oshagbemi (2004) performed age-related research on a diverse population of 1,440 managers who were given a questionnaire that measured four leadership styles – directive, consultative, participative, or delegate – in their daily activities. The results found that older leaders consulted more often and favored a more participative leadership style than did younger leaders. However, in somewhat of a contrast with the findings of Oshagbemi (2004), Doherty (1997) found that younger AD's were perceived to demonstrate all of the transformational leadership traits significantly more often than did older ADs. Additionally, older ADs were perceived to use passive management by exception significantly more often than did younger ADs.

Kabacoff and Stoffey (2001) contended the research that examined age in relationship to leadership and overall organizational performance was inconclusive. The researchers continued to explain that there were two distinct arguments concerning age. The first argued that older leaders tended to be more rigid and less likely to be prone to transformation. On the other hand, as a result of years of experience, older leaders tended to have the maturity and wisdom that allowed them to anticipate issues and respond with confidence. Oshagbemi (2004) agreed in the importance of age related leadership research in stating, "... with older workers remaining in the workplace longer and technology driving the rapid promotion of younger workers, few people will doubt that effective synergy between leaders of diverse ages becomes very important

30

indeed" (p. 16). As with gender, age has been evaluated as a function of the five

transformational leadership dimensions and the three transactional leadership dimensions

previously discussed.

Gender

In 1971, after the creation of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women,

females administered 90% of women's athletic programs. In 2000, women administered only

18% of women's athletic programs. In most cases, this was a result of both gender's athletic

programs falling under a single AD rather than having the women's programs delegated to an

assistant AD. Harrison and Solmon (2004) noted that women coached only 42.4% of women's

teams. In contrast, men coached over 98% of men intercollegiate athletic teams. Interestingly,

Acosta and Carpenter (2004) noted that as a result of merging male and female athletic

administration in response to Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, the

intercollegiate athletic administration community has been heavily male-dominated. Whisenant,

Pedersen, and Obenour (2002) summarized this unusual situation by stating, "It is not the

maintenance of power by force. Rather it is the maintenance of power by consent to what

appears to be inevitable. It is the simple acceptance of the status quo in society" (p. 486).

According to Powell, Butterfield, and Bartol (2008), sports organizations worldwide were

places where men and men's activities were advantaged. Yet it may well be that this

preponderance of men was dysfunctional at the level of leadership style. Avolio and Bass (2004)

suggested that prior research indicated, that women in leadership roles were more

transformational and, as a result, both male and female followers rated female leaders with a

higher degree of satisfaction and effectiveness compared to their male counterparts (Bass,

Avolio, & Atwater, 1996). Results from a meta analysis conducted by Eagly and Carli (2003)

31

indicated that female leaders were more transformational than male leaders. The research also suggested that male leaders were more likely to demonstrate transactional behaviors.

Many studies have focused on the relation between gender and leadership styles, in particular the transformational-transactional leadership distinction. Bass and Avolio (1990) conducted a study testing the gender differences of transformational and transactional leadership with a population of upper level managers of Fortune 500 corporations. The findings indicate that both male and female subordinates viewed female managers as more transformational leaders. Specifically, women were more likely to be transformational leaders, defined as those who served as role models and mentors, empowered workers, and encouraged innovation even when the organization they led was generally successful. Bass and Avolio (1990) also found variances in transactional leadership, noting that female managers were rated as displaying significantly more contingent reward behaviors and that male managers exhibited significantly more management-by-exception behaviors. These results followed the stereotypical research that has been performed concerning gender variances in transformational and transactional leadership theory. The results of Doherty (1997), also stereotypical, were that female ADs were perceived to demonstrate charisma, inspiration, and individual consideration significantly more often than the male ADs. With regards to transactional leadership, the findings indicated that male ADs were perceived to demonstrate passive management-by-exception significantly more often than female ADs.

Peachey and Burton (2011) noted that gender stereotyping of managerial positions was responsible for a bias toward women in the hiring of management roles, training and advancement to upper level positions. According to a Catalyst (2009) report, the distribution of women in leadership was as follows: 13.5% of Fortune 500 executive officer positions, 15.2% of

corporate board positions, and 50.8% of all managerial and professional positions. These statistics alone suggested significant improvement from past decades; however, they also showed that women continued to face obstacles in reaching the very top management and leadership positions.

Transformational versus Transactional Leadership

Transformational Leadership

The origins of formal inquiry into transformational leadership began with the work of Burns in 1978. At the broadest level, Burns explains transactional leadership as follows:

> The relations of most leaders and followers are transactional – leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties (Burns, 1978, p. 4).

Burns also defined transformational leadership:

> Transforming leadership, while more complex, is more potent. The transforming leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in the followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents (Burns, 1978, p. 4).

The ability to provide inspirational leadership has been addressed in what was considered a robust literature focused on leadership style, which has be formally defined in an organizational context as transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). Succinctly, a transformational leader worked with others in a manner such that they were inspired to

internalize the goals of an organization as their own (Avolio & Bass, 2004). According to Bass (1985), terms like charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and moral consideration of others were measurable attributes that have come to define transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership was further defined and developed through the work of Bass (1985) who described it as an inspirational leadership style that influences followers to achieve extraordinary performance in a contemporary context of innovation and change. Furthermore, Bass (1985) held that transactional leaders encouraged associates through appealing to their personal desires by incorporating a system of exchange. Bass (1985) further defined the distinction between leadership styles as transactional leaders focused on doing things right and transformational leaders focused on doing the right things. This distinction suggested a process-based focus for transactional leadership and a substantive focus for transformational leadership. Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) agreed that transformational leaders sought to inspire, establish focus and vision, and motivate associates to participate and take the initiative in changing the organization. It was certainly the case that while transformational leadership was considered effective in many situations, the actual conditions of leadership were sufficiently complex, enough that different approaches were necessary in different organizational settings. In this context, environmental variables increased or decreased the success of transformational and transactional leadership.

There were many ways in which transformational leadership exerted influence, and some of these ways have emerged in prior studies. Transformational leadership was akin to charismatic leadership, a style that drew its force from less rationalistic and more experiential approaches to leadership (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004; Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004; Torpman, 2004; Tucker & Russell, 2004; Yukl,

34

Gordon, & Taber, 2002). In a different sense, Bass and Riggio (2006) and Kearney and Gebert (2009) provided empirical evidence that transformational leaders were less likely to make impulsive decisions, particularly when those decisions existed in a context of urgency. For Tucker and Russell (2004), transformational leaders were innovative in nature and were more concerned with their followers' quality of life, a concern that seemed to effectively enhance productivity. Transformational leaders motivated followers throughout history to envision possibilities when change was necessary to achieve organizational goals (Bass, 1990; Dessler, 2001; Northouse, 2001).

Transactional Leadership

Several aspects of transactional leadership have emerged from both theoretical and empirical studies. According to Oshagbemi (2004), transactional leaders focused on delineation of the various roles and responsibilities required for associates to achieve preferred outcomes. The author attempted to clarify that transactional leaders, in contrast to transformational leaders, used power and authority that already existed through areas like organizational structures and hierarchies. Bass (1985) explained that, like transformational leaders, transactional leaders recognized what motivated others. However, the transactional leader tended to perceive that their needs and desires would be satisfied through successful completion of tasks that needed to be accomplished. Transformational leaders were on the contrary interested to associate performance to less task-specific outcomes and more overall development outcomes. In both cases, but in somewhat different ways, associates' desires and needs were contingent on achieving the overall organizational goals and commitments.

Transformational v. Transactional Leadership

Through hierarchical regression analysis, Waldman, Bass and Yammarino (1999) provide some evidence that transformational leadership could provide marginal improvement over the effectiveness of transactional leadership; however, in the reverse, transactional leadership did not improve on transformational leadership. Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino (1999) suggested that there was a positive connection between transactional concerns to clarify task requirements and transformational concerns with internal attributes like confidence and self-actualization. They stated: "The clarification of task requirements may also contribute to subordinates' confidence that with some degree of effort, they can succeed in accomplishing their assignments and fulfilling their roles" (Waldman et al., 1999, p. 382).

Howell and Avolio (1993) and Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino (1990) pointed out that transformational leadership did not replace transactional leadership; instead, it augmented transactional leadership in achieving the goals of the leader, associate, group, and organization. Even though transformational leaders could be transactional when the situation dictated, transactional leadership was often a remedy for lower levels of accomplishment or non-significant change, according to a number of large-scale surveys of industrial, military, governmental, and religious leaders (Avolio & Bass, 1988; Avolio & Bass, 1993) and other researchers (Lowe & Kroeck, 1996; Murray, 1988; Onnen, 1987). This sense of the added scope of transformational leadership was captured in Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino's allusion to Franklin Roosevelt -- "Franklin Roosevelt, another eminent charismatic, could also display both kinds of leadership with great effectiveness, articulating an inspirational world vision while often promising political favors to individuals and groups" (Waldman et al., 1999, p. 384). The vision stemmed from the transformational; the political favors stemmed from the transactional.

36

According to Bass (1990), Kearney and Gebert (2009), and Yukl (2006), transformational leadership increased follower enthusiasm and accomplishment. Transactional and transformational leadership were not and should not be mutually exclusive. The above-mentioned classification was identified mainly by factor analysis of a behavior explanation questionnaire called the MLQ 5X-short (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1998; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Riggio, Bass, & Orr, 2004). According to Avolio and Bass (2004), their goal in creating the MLQ was to expand the range of leadership styles evaluated by the raters and their associates to what many people have described as the ideal leadership style.

Transformational leadership seemed appealing under the assumption that change was both frequent and necessary to organizational performance. Avolio and Bass (2004) suggested that the success of leaders depended upon their abilities to adjust and be flexible to whatever transition arose and at ease with the variety in decisions and actions that followed from the necessary modifications. If the rather stale cliché of our time being a time of rapid change was correct, then Cascio (1995) was correct to suggest that, "more often today's networked, interdependent, culturally diverse organization requires transformational leadership" (p. 930). Parry and Proctor-Thompson (2003) added that transformational leadership enabled an organization to adapt to a demanding environment of continual change. According to Avolio and Bass (1993), transformational leadership should be a part of an organizational culture because the organization could adapt quicker to immediate needs. Thus, the researchers suggested that transformational leadership style involved leaders who motivated, coached, engaged, and led teams to be more innovative. Thus, it stood in sharp contrast to managerial preferences for control and micromanagement.

In a changing environment, organizations must become more flexible and leaders need to be more transformational (Bass, 1999). During turbulent times, innovation increased the likelihood of an organization's success. Bass (1999) found that when leadership did not anticipate turbulent times, organizations could spiral downward, out of control, losing workers, profit, and eventually collapsing. As will be discussed, the conditions under which contemporary athletic administration were carried out shared much with this focus on change, innovation, and what it meant for leadership.

Leadership Theory

In his study of political leaders, Burns (1978) provided a general comparison of the constructs that describe transactional and transformational leadership. In his evaluation, the transactional leader pursued a cost-benefit exchange, which provided concrete rewards for the achievement of tasks. According to Avolio and Bass (1988), transactional leaders defined an agreement with their followers, in which they clarified the followers' responsibilities, their own expectations, the tasks that were to be completed, and the rewards that followers received for fulfilling the agreement. However, in transactional leadership the leader and followers did not maintain an ongoing purpose that held them together. Burns (1978) suggested that although this was a form of leadership, it was not the kind that tied leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of higher purpose.

Burns (1978) considered transactional and transformational leadership to be mutually exclusive. Bass (1985) built on the work of Burns (1978) to develop a theory of transformational leadership that has been used heavily by researchers. According to Bass's theory, transformational leaders needed the ability to recognize the needs, aspirations, and values of their

followers and the skill to conceive and articulate strategies and goals that motivated followers to exert their best efforts (Avolio & Bass, 1988).

Parry and Proctor-Thompson (2003) examined the developmental aspects of transformational leadership in a New Zealand government agency. In this study, transformational leadership was characterized by factors representing idealized influence, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. The study tested the hypothesis that transformational leadership behaviors identified in first-level managers also existed in second-level managers who reported directly to the first level. In other words, through the use of individualized consideration and other transformational properties, leaders mentored employees into becoming transformational themselves. According to Avolio and Bass (2004), this was known as "the falling dominoes effect" in that if one leader demonstrated transformational inclinations then other managers underneath him or her were likely to do so as well. This effect was confirmed by the study for all three transformational factors investigated.

In most early studies, information on transformational leadership behavior and the overall effectiveness of the leader was developed from the same method - primarily through questionnaires completed by those reporting to the leader. This research design allowed for potential bias due to same source data (Avolio, Yammarino, & Bass, 1991). In their study of managers and subordinates in a large industrial organization, Avolio, Waldman, Einstein (1987) were among the first to evaluate leadership behaviors and leadership outcomes with separate measures. To determine the impact of transformational dimensions, they used the outcomes of the existing employee appraisal process, hypothesized that if transformational leadership did indeed lead to higher levels of employee performance, and then employees who reported to transformational leaders should show better reviews as measured by the appraisal system. In

fact, the transformational factors of charisma and individualized consideration were significantly correlated with employee performance within this study.

Hater and Bass (1988) added an independent source of leader effectiveness in their study of an express delivery company. In addition to follower perceptions of leader effectiveness, they used the leaders' superiors to evaluate the leaders and the performance outcomes of the groups they led. Their conclusions that transformational leadership behaviors added to leader effectiveness and employee satisfaction beyond that of transactional leadership were consistent with other studies. Similarly, Avolio, Yammarino and Bass (1991) used the performance and promotion data provided by superior officers to evaluate leadership behaviors of Navy officers. They measured leader performance in three ways. First, they collected questionnaire data from the officers' subordinates to gauge perceived performance. Second, official Navy records completed by the officers' superiors provided performance and promotion data that were used as indicators of actual performance. Finally, the officers rated themselves with regard to leadership effectiveness. In general, the transformational scales were consistent with expected results of both perceived and actual performance. However, the self-ratings tended to be inflated in comparison to perceived and actual performance, but the more successful officers were less likely to inflate their self-described leadership behavior than were the less successful officers.

Further studies used quantitative outcomes to measure the impact of transformational leadership. Howell and Avolio (1993) used financial performance of specific business departments over a one-year period to provide an objective gauge of the impact of transformational leadership. In their study of managers in large financial institutions, the researchers collected data on business department performance one year after they collected data on leadership behaviors of the business unit leaders. They found that the existence of higher

40

levels of transformational dimensions corresponded to stronger business unit performance. Conversely, unlike many other studies, the transactional factor of contingent reward was negatively correlated with performance, instead of a lower, positive correlation, as had been predicted based on prior research. Similarly, Keller (1992) attempted to use objective, quantitative criteria for success in his study of transformational leadership in industrial research and development teams. As hypothesized, transformational leadership factors scored higher on the measures of development quality and budget / schedule performance.

Other empirical studies examined a variety of dimensions from Bass's transformational leadership model. Avolio, Waldman, and Einstein (1988), in their study of 190 second-year MBA students using a management game simulation, found that the transformational leadership factors of idealized influence, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation correlated with higher levels of organizational effectiveness. Specifically, they determined that members of successful teams attributed more transformational qualities to their leaders. The transactional factor of contingent reward also correlated positively to team performance, but to a lesser degree. Management-by-exception was not correlated with high team effectiveness. Similarly, Bycio, Hackett, and Allen (1995) found these same transformational factors had strong positive relationships with outcomes such as subordinates' extra effort, satisfaction with the leader, and subordinate-rated leader effectiveness in a study of 1,376 registered nurses. Contingent reward was also positively related to these outcomes, but to a smaller degree. Management-by-exception correlated negatively to these measures, as expected. Greater degrees of transformational leadership were associated with reductions in intent to leave the nursing profession, while management-by-exception had a significantly smaller association with this

intention. As expected, organizational commitment had strong positive relationships with each of the transformational dimensions.

Bass and Riggio (2006) evaluated and analyzed the empirical and theoretical leadership research within four publications of Bass's comprehensive handbook on transformational and transactional leadership. In his most recent and final book on leadership this originator of social scientific investigation of leadership paralleled the study of leadership with the rise of civilization. He recognized that leadership was a universal phenomenon and because of its significant role in business, educational, and military settings it remained an important focus for study and research. Bass and Riggio (2006) indicated that the conceptual research in leadership specified that leadership be properly defined as directing the attention of other members to goals and paths in order to achieve the common objective. Therefore, according to Bass and Riggio (2006), leaders were agents of change, whose acts affected others; people more than other people's acts affected them.

The organizational success of transformational leadership was not in question. Study after study routinely demonstrated its effectiveness in diverse situations, ranging from profit-oriented organizations (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996), trade unions (Kelloway & Barling, & Shah 1993), young workers (Barling, Loughlin, & Kelloway, 2002), and sports teams (Charbonneau, Barling, & Kelloway, 2001; Zacharatos, Barling, & Kelloway, 2000). DeGroot, Kiker and Cross (2000), and Dumdum, Lowe, and Avolio (2002) conducted meta-analyses that provided a review of hundreds of studies of transformational leadership style. According to Bass (1985), the factor of charisma accounted for 60% of significant differences in transformational leadership research.

Based on research between 1985 and 1995, the theory expanded to five transformational factors to include charisma, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. According to Bass (1985), charisma was considered a vital component of idealized influence. According to Waldman and Yammarino (1999), charisma was the quality that set apart most leaders from other people, and therefore, transformational leadership was perceived to be synonymous with charisma. Yet, Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2004) suggest that transformational leadership was not considered to be tantamount with charisma, although charisma was frequently considered to be a significant part of such leadership. Additionally, the researcher contended that efforts to study and investigate charismatic leadership predated research about transformational concepts by many decades.

De Cremer and Knippenberg (2002) conducted three studies: a scenario experiment, a cross-sectional survey, and a laboratory experiment. They concluded that leader charisma as measured by items from Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire prompted greater levels of cooperation among followers, than was measured with the other four transformational factors. The researchers argued that leader charisma produced cooperation because such leadership behaviors appealed to relational concerns of followers. Barling, Weber and Kelloway (1996) completed a field comparison with 20 managers trained in experimental leadership training and compared them to control groups. The results indicated positive training effects especially on the managers' intellectual stimulation. Barling et al. (1996) suggested that transformational leaders became intellectually stimulated to the extent that they could distinguish, understand, conceptualize, and communicate to their associates the opportunities and threats that faced their organization, as well as its strengths, weaknesses, and comparative advantages.

According to Bass (1985), it was through intellectual stimulation of associates that the status quo was questioned and that new, creative methods of accomplishing the organization's mission were explored. Bass's theoretical work was oriented toward five dimensions of leadership and three dimensions of transactional leadership. These dimensions provided the necessary specificity to what would otherwise be an overly abstract theory of leadership. To that end, these immersions formed the semantic domain necessary to many of the hypotheses of relevance to this study. The dimensions are described below.

Idealized Influence

Charismatic leadership as defined by Bass (1985) was a significant dimension of the complete transformational leadership theory. This charismatic component was referred to as idealized influence. Podsakoff, MacKensie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) examined the influence of transformational leader behaviors on organizational citizenship behaviors, and the possible mediating role that subordinates' trust and satisfaction might influence that process. The sample was obtained from exempt employees in a large petrochemical company. The results indicated that the effects of the transformational leader behaviors on citizenship behaviors were indirect, rather than direct, in that they were mediated by followers' trust in their leaders. The researchers suggested that idealized influence allowed leaders to be role models, providing an example for employees to follow that was consistent with the values that were advocated by the leader. The researchers further contended that these leaders were admired, respected, and trusted. Charismatic leaders were seen to have unusual capabilities, persistence, and determination, were willing to take risks, and were consistent in their actions. They exhibited high standards of ethical and moral behavior. Bass (1998) contended that charismatic leaders supported pride, faith, and respect and had a distinctive ability for seeing what was actually important. Idealized

influence enabled leaders to communicate a sense of mission. They were able to identify new opportunities for their organizations by developing, communicating, and inspiring their followers with a vision of the future.

Idealized influence enabled leaders to recognize the need for revitalization, according to Devanna and Tichy (1990). In their study of CEOs of large corporations, they found that successful leaders encountered and overcame challenges when they attempted to alert the organization to growing threats from the environment. In their study, leaders saw themselves as visionary change agents who trusted their intuition and were able to communicate a set of core values that guided their behavior. These were all traits derived from idealized influence. According to Devanna and Tichy (1990), although idealized influence was an essential component of transformational leadership, it was not enough by itself to fully recognize organizational transformation.

There were distinct differences between charismatic leadership and Bass's (1985) transformational leadership. For instance, transformational leaders sought to give power to and promote followers, while charismatic leaders tended to seek out ways to keep followers weak and reliant, in quest of personal loyalty rather than commitment to an organizational mission. In addition, Yukl (1989) suggested that transformational leadership could be established in any organization at any level, whereas, charismatic leadership was rare and usually only found in top administration. Unlike charisma, transformational leadership was a leadership process that could be learned and managed. Devanna and Tichy (1990) suggested that it was a methodical process consisting of a strategic and organized search for changes, rational analysis, and the capacity to move resources from areas of lesser to greater productivity to bring about a purposeful transformation of the organization.

45

Inspirational Motivation

Avolio and Bass (2004) described inspirational motivation as a subset of idealized influence. However, the researchers recognized the fact that leaders did not have to possess idealized influence to be inspirational. According to Yukl and Van Fleet (1992), the ability to build confidence in followers in their ability to accomplish group goals was an important skill for the inspirational leader. Transformational leaders motivated and inspired those around them by providing significance and challenge to their followers' work and by promoting team spirit, enthusiasm, and confidence (Yukl, 2006).

Bennis (1985) conducted interviews with 90 successful CEOs from both the private and public sectors. Their study focused on leaders who had "achieved fortunate mastery over present confusion" (Bennis, 1985, p. 21); that is, those individuals who were effectively proactive in understanding the challenges faced by their organizations in an environment of continuous, rapid change. All ninety people had a focus on outcomes, and their concentration of vision allowed them to capture the attention of their followers to concentrate on the visualization. They found that successful leaders motivated their followers to achieve a vision through inspired interaction. In order to implement the plan of growth and development, the leader had to be able to articulate the agenda and to influence followers that the outcomes were desirable. Thus, Bennis (1985) emphasized that the ability to relate a compelling image of a future circumstance that generated enthusiasm and dedication seemed to undoubtedly enhance the success of leaders.

According to Senge (1990), the essence of inspirational motivation was that leaders must understand reality, define a vision for the future, and inspire followers to pursue the vision passionately. Avolio and Bass (2004) suggested that if any one idea about leadership had inspired organizations more so than other ideas, it was the notion of a shared image of the future

46

they seek to create made possible through efforts to empower people to excel and learn, not

because they were told to, but because of an authentic desire. According to Bass (1985),

inspirational motivation required that the leader shared a common vision, while he challenged

followers to high standards and ethics grounded in that shared vision. Lee and Chang (2006)

investigated transformational leadership extensively, because "transformational leadership styles

have been shown to inspire subordinates to achieve the higher level of performance and promise

to leaders" (p. 218). The researchers believed employees could not be innovative unless

inspired. Tarabishy (2005) emphasized that innovation was essential to any organization's

ability to meet the demands of a competitive global economy. Inspiring workers relied on a

creative type of leadership because leadership was capable of creating opportunities for

employees and the organization.

Intellectual Stimulation

Bass (1985) described intellectual stimulation as "the arousal and change in followers of

problem awareness and problem solving, of thought and imagination, and of beliefs and values,

rather than arousal and change of immediate action" (p. 99). He meant that by stimulating the

intellect of followers, transformational leaders could cause an increase in the ability of followers

to understand the nature of the organization and the problems it faced and that they were better

able to comprehend the issues at hand and to conceptualize potential solutions. Bass (1985)

suggested that the emphasis was more on creative, well-developed ideas than on immediate

action. According to Podsakoff, MacKensie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990), such behavior by the

leader challenged followers to re-examine some of their assumptions about their work and to

rethink how it could be accomplished.

The balance of risk and trust was a key element in intellectual stimulation. Devanna and

Tichy (1990) held that transformational leaders were prudent risk takers and fostered an environment of such prudence in the organizations that they led. They created an environment that was flexible and open to learning from experience, a type of learning, which facilitated prudent management of risk. Bennis (1985) held that trust was critical to fostering an environment open to innovation. According to the authors, trust was granted to those who made their values, decisions, and actions transparent to others and to those who were predictable, consistent, and persistent. Trust enabled the leader to prepare the organization to deal with the confusion that certainly accompanied change and innovation. Schein (1992) agreed that the key to an intellectually stimulating environment was trust. He maintained that if trust was present, then clear communication, empathy, synergy, and productive interdependency were likely to be present as well.

Senge (1990) held that leaders were responsible for building organizations that enable people to grow. In a learning organization, leaders were designers and teachers. Leaders designed learning processes so that people throughout the organization could deal productively with the critical issues they faced. According to Senge, leaders who were teachers helped people throughout the organization develop a systemic understanding of their organization and its environment. Therefore, the leaders enabled the people to strike a prudent balance between the organization's larger purpose and the practical tasks that were performed routinely.

Individual Consideration

Consideration for others was another important aspect of transformational leadership. According to Bass (1985), this dimension of transformational leadership was found to have a positive impact on subordinate satisfaction with leaders, as well as overall productivity. Podsakoff, MacKensie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) advocated that individualized support on the

48

part of the leader indicated that he or she respected followers and was concerned about their personal feelings and needs. Bass (1998) contended that individual consideration was evident when the leader delegated projects to stimulate learning experiences, provided coaching and teaching, and treated each follower as an individual, thereby fostering the acceptance of group goals. He stressed that the developmental aspect of individualized consideration was a key element. Bass (1985) held that "it was the transforming leader who has a developmental orientation toward his subordinates" (p. 85).

Individual Consideration was a very useful tool in becoming a transformational leader. Podsakoff, MacKensie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) recognized that the importance of individual consideration in creating a new transformed human organization was to be the design for the future. Avolio and Bass (2004) suggested that this emerging paradigm required an uncomplicated change: value the follower for their own personal growth, instead of a tool for increasing profitability. Transformational leaders differed from transactional leaders in that they did not merely recognize the needs of followers but also attempted to elevate those needs from lower to higher levels of development and maturity (Devanna & Tichy, 1990). Transformational leaders engage the "full" person with the purpose of developing followers into leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1990). They paid special attention to each follower's needs for achievement and growth by acting as coach or mentor. According to Yukl (2006), communication was viewed as a very important part of the process; therefore, transformational leaders were recognized as effective listeners.

Contingent Reward

Some managers provided rewards to followers who performed in accordance with agreed upon expectations or satisfactorily carried out an assignment. According to Bass (1985),

contingent rewards could take on a number of forms, including praise for work well done, recommendations for pay increases, bonuses, promotions, or commendations for meritorious effort including public recognition and honors for outstanding service. Contingent penalization was also used when the task was not completed satisfactorily. According to Bass (1985), this process of rewarding and penalizing employee behavior was "characteristic of transaction-oriented managers because such managers, unlike transforming leaders, were more concerned with efficient processes than with substantive ideas" (p. 122). Yukl (1989) suggested that this type of exchange has been found to be reasonably effective, although not as much as any of the transformational components in motivating others to achieve higher levels of development and performance.

Management-by-Exception

Management-by-exception was corrective in nature. In general, Bass (1998) explained that the leader avoided giving directions if the old ways were working and allowed followers to continue doing their jobs in a routine way if performance goals were met. He continued by expressing that the process tended to be less effective than contingent reward or the components of transformational leadership. Management-by-exception could be active or passive. According to Bass (1985), transactional leaders who practiced active management-by-exception monitored the work of subordinates, and corrective action was taken to ensure that the work was carried out effectively. He continued to explain that the leader arranged to actively monitor deviations from standards, mistakes, and errors in the followers' assignments and to take corrective action as necessary. Bass (1985) differentiated between active and passive by suggesting that managers who practiced passive management-by-exception used contingent punishments and other corrective action in response to obvious deviations from acceptable

50

performance standards. He explained that such managers waited passively for deviations, mistakes, and errors to occur and then took corrective action. Bass (1985) suggested that, for efficiency reasons, leaders sometimes practice passive management-by- exception when they were supervising a large number of subordinates who reported directly to them.

In summary, this section has explained briefly the nature of the eight components of leadership that structured the relationship between transformational and transactional styles. In examining intercollegiate athletic administration, the study investigated the AD's propensities to view their own styles in the context of these eight dimensions. This evidence needed to be understood in the context of existing research into the relation between leadership style and athletic administration.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Bass (1985) created the original MLQ, which was the primary research instrument for transformational and transactional leadership theory for a large body of research from 1985 through the present. It was the questionnaire employed in the present study. The current form of the MLQ was developed by Avolio and Bass (2004) and used as the instrument administered in their study through two confirmatory analyses to test the construct validity and to refine the original instrument. It contained 45 items that identified and measured key leadership and effectiveness behaviors shown in prior research to be strongly linked with both individual and organizational achievement. The validation process demonstrated factorial and convergent validity, as well as internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and high inter-rater agreement. Factorial validity considers the ability of a measure to capture the theoretical construct that it purported to represent. Convergent validity considered the association between different measures designed to capture the same theoretical construct. The major leadership constructs

51

were transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and passive/avoidant leadership. Avolio and Bass (2004) suggested that this model built on earlier leadership models such as those of autocratic versus democratic leadership, directive versus participative leadership, and task versus relationship oriented leadership, which dominated hiring, training, development, and research in this field for the past half-century. The MLQ provided a synoptic view of a broader range of leadership behaviors, from laissez-faire to idealized leadership, while it also differentiated ineffective from effective leaders (Rowold, 2005). Bono and Judge (2004) performed another meta-study of the MLQ that focused on five leadership behaviors: Transformational Leadership, Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception (active), Management-by-Exception (passive), and Laissez-Faire. According to Bono and Judge (2004), meta-analysis provided support for the validity and the reliability of the MLQ. As noted previously, this study used five components for transformational leadership (IIa, IIb, IM, IS, and IC) and three components for transactional leadership (CR, AME, and PME).

Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) conducted a meta-analysis of results from 39 studies that used the MLQ. The results of this analysis confirmed the conclusion that effective leaders emphasized transformational behaviors but also used relevant transactional behaviors in certain situations. The three transformational behaviors of idealized influence, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation were related to leadership effectiveness in most studies. Moderator variables suggested by the literature, including hierarchical level of the leader and organizational setting, were empirically tested and found to have differential impacts on correlations between the leaders' style and effectiveness. The relationship was stronger for subordinate self-rated effort than for an independent criterion of leadership effectiveness (e.g., ratings of the leader by superiors, objective performance of the leader's

52

organizational unit). Transformational leadership behaviors correlated more strongly, more

positively, and more consistently with leadership effectiveness than did transactional leadership

behaviors. The transactional dimension of contingent reward behavior was correlated with

leadership effectiveness in some studies, but passive management-by-exception did not improve

leadership effectiveness.

The meta-analyses also found that transformational leadership behaviors were more

commonly observed in public organizations than in private organizations. According to Avolio

and Bass (2004), organizational level was a moderating factor, as scores on transformational

leadership scales were higher for lower-level managers than for higher-level managers.

Additionally, relationships were found to be stronger between transformational leadership

measures and subordinate perceptions of effectiveness than for organizational measures of

effectiveness, such as objective business unit performance or employee appraisals.

Organizational measures, while perhaps reducing the common method bias problem, may not be

especially valid measures of the effectiveness of the transformational characteristics of the

leader, as they were often designed to capture primarily transactional outcomes. Avolio and

Bass (1988) noted that many performance appraisal systems — an example of an organizational

measure - did not emphasize performance beyond expectations, and thus the relationship with

transformational leadership could be misleading. In this sense, Lowe, Kroeck, and

Sivasubramaniam (1996) suggested that subordinate perceptions of effectiveness might be a

better indicator of the impact of transformational leadership on motivation and performance than

organizational outcomes or independent performance evaluations, despite the issue of same

source data.

MLQ Research in Intercollegiate Athletics

According to Bass (1985), the raw data from the MLQ measured three outcomes: (a) perceived effort as follower, (b) perceived satisfaction as follower, and (c) perceived effectiveness as follower. Peachey and Burton (2011) and Burton and Peachey (2009) were two studies that used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to measure leadership style in relation to intercollegiate athletic administration. The population for the 2011 study was NCAA Divisions I and II AD's, which was to add to the initial 2009 research evaluating NCAA Division III AD's. The researchers used vignettes in order to have the AD evaluate the leader's behavior in the vignette. The vignettes were created for this study and represented transformational and transactional leadership as it related to intercollegiate athletic departments. The MLQ was the instrument used in order to measure the dimensions of both transformational and transactional leadership style, and thereby determined which led to more positive perceptions of organizational outcomes. In addition, the researchers examined these perceptions based on the gender of the AD. A multivariate analysis of variance was used to examine the effects of leadership style, gender of the AD, and gender of the leader described in the vignette. In their study, they examined how NCAA ADs perceive transformational and transactional leadership style.

Specifically, the NCAA AD's answered the MLQ based on their perception as a follower of the leader depicted in the vignette. In other words, the AD answered the questionnaire as if they were the subordinates confronted with the hypothetical situation described within both the transformational vignette and the transactional vignette. The current study design differed from other related research because data was collected on AD's perceptions of their leadership style. According to Peachey and Burton (2011), the purpose of using vignettes in their study was to

examine the AD preferences for leadership style, rather than followers' preferences. This framework allowed for the researchers to examine how the ADs led and interacted within their athletic departments. This study specifically concentrated on the AD preferences as they related to the demographic characteristics of age and gender and the institutional characteristic of NCAA division.

An interesting finding in both the Burton and Peachey (2009) study with a population of Division III AD's and the Peachey and Burton (2011) study with a population of Division II and I AD's was that there was a significant relationship between transformational leadership in both effort and satisfaction; however, there were no significant findings with perceived effectiveness. Peachey and Burton (2011) suggested that this might be due to the task-oriented nature of "effectiveness" lending itself to a more transactional style of leadership. Yukl (2006) suggested that transactional leadership had a stronger focus on task behavior and completion than did the transformational style of leadership.

The MLQ was also used in conjunction with other instruments in order to measure a variety of outcomes based on leadership style. Hakwoo (2009) required the use of multiple instruments including: MLQ, Meyer and Allen's Organizational Commitment Instrument, Michigan's Organizational Assessment Questionnaire, Organizational Citizenship Behavior Instrument and demographic questions. Hakwoo's (2009) population was 2,627 NCAA Division II coaches who evaluated their AD's as leaders. This methodology, which incorporated the MLQ, allowed the researcher to focus on AD's leadership style and the impact on followers' attitudinal behaviors and job performance. The time and effort necessary to respond to the number of instruments used in this research could have impacted the response rate, which was only 13.7% (359 coaches).

Some researchers developed hypotheses in order to measure a select few of the dimensions measured by the MLQ (Pratti, Caesar, Ferris, Ammeter, & Buckley, 2003). Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) studied the impact of transformational and transactional leadership styles on the organizational outcomes of effort, satisfaction, and effectiveness in relation to Canadian intercollegiate athletic administration. However, the researchers did not develop their framework into a model that used satisfaction and commitment as mediating factors. Consequently, Doherty (1997) expanded on this research by narrowing the population to member schools of the Ontario Universities Athletic Association. The sample consisted of 13 ADs, 19 assistant athletic directors, and 6 head coaches for each of the 32 administrators. The researcher used the MLQ as the instrument to examine the effect of the transformational / transactional leadership dimensions on the leader behavior and the impact on interuniversity athletic administrators, as rated by their coaches.

In addition, Doherty (1997) examined the impact that gender and age of the AD had on leadership style. Out of a sample of 192 head coaches, the researcher attained a response rate of 59% or 114 coaches, with a minimum of 2 coaches for each administrator. Age and gender exhibited significant results with relation to the MLQ dimensions of transformational/transactional leadership. Female ADs/AADs were perceived to demonstrate stronger characteristics in charisma, inspiration, and individual consideration. On the other hand, male ADs/AADs were perceived to demonstrate passive management by exception significantly more than their female counterparts. In addition, the results indicated that younger ADs/AADs were perceived to demonstrate all of the transformational leadership dimensions significantly more often than older ADs/AADs. In contrast, their older counterparts were perceived to use passive management by exception significantly more often.

Yusof (1998) researched the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of AD's and coaches' job satisfaction, but did not consider transactional leadership on other organizational outcomes. The participants of this study included a random selection of NCAA Division III coaches. The Transformational Leadership Behavior Inventory developed by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) was used as the instrument to measure the coaches' perception of the transformational leadership behaviors of ADs within their respective athletic departments. A second instrument, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967), was used in order to measure the dimensions of job satisfaction. The results indicated that there was a significant relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of ADs and the job satisfaction of coaches.

Choi (2007) expanded on earlier research to include additional work-related outcomes in addition to job satisfaction. The researchers examined the transformational leadership style of ADs in relationship to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizen behavior, as perceived by head coaches from major conferences within the NCAA. Choi et al. (2007) expanded on the research by examining the perceptions of student-athletes on leadership. The researchers used two web-based instruments in order to collect data from 927 head coaches and 1,064 student athletes from 53 institutions of the major five conferences in the NCAA during the 2005-06 academic year. The results indicated that transformational leadership characteristics were significantly associated with all three of the work-related outcomes that were used in the study. The data signified that the head coaches for the most part perceived their ADs as a leader having charismatic leadership. In addition, the student athletes perceived responsiveness and empathy as the foremost dimensions of service quality. This study added to the current literature by examining transformational leadership from the perspective of the AD.

57

Summary

This chapter presented the historical context of leadership research as well as the development of transactional and transformational leadership literature in order to serve as a framework for the proposed study. By exploring leadership characteristics of athletic directors, this research could (a) contribute to the body of scholarly research devoted to athletic administration, (b) increase the knowledge base of other colleges and universities with regard to effective leadership styles, and (c) create greater awareness of leadership style and effectiveness in athletics. In spite of the large, accumulated body of literature on transformational leadership in the area of higher education administration, the topic has been given remarkably little attention in the literature related to intercollegiate athletic administration (Peachey & Burton, 2011). Hakwoo (2009) explained that the studies that have been done connecting leadership with intercollegiate athletic administration generally involved job satisfaction, university presidents' roles, or coaches' perspectives of athletic director leadership style. With a unique twist on perception, this study's primary focus was on the self-perceived leadership style of athletic directors and the relation to NCAA divisional demands and responsibilities.

This chapter provided the review of existing studies on leadership styles, divisional responsibilities of NCAA athletic directors, as well as the various challenges these programs were facing, such as the media, the economic conditions and financial strains placed on funding in higher education, and the demands and responsibilities placed on athletic administration by the NCAA. This chapter also reviewed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and the dimensions of leadership that are measured by this instrument. It was imperative to understand the connection of leadership style of ADs within their own division and the relationship that

leadership styles had to a particular set of responsibilities and demands set forth by the NCAA in

Divisions I, II, & III. Thus the present study aimed to accomplish.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The research question explored in this study considered to what degree NCAA ADs'
perceived themselves to demonstrate more or less transformational and transactional leadership
dimensions. Specifically, the study investigated to what degree these dimensions related to the
independent variables of NCAA Division, age, and gender. This study was unique in that it was
the only known study that looked at the self-perceived leadership style of the ADs as university
administrators. According to Avolio and Bass (2004), the MLQ had been shown to be similarly
effective when supervisors, colleagues, peers, or direct reports rated the leader. In this study the
MLQ was taken directly from NCAA ADs: therefore, it was representing a self-perception of
how the ADs viewed their own leadership style.

This chapter outlined the procedures followed to evaluate transformational and
transactional leadership style, as perceived by the NCAA AD's and to test whether those
perceptions were associated with three independent variables including: NCAA Division, gender,
and age. Areas to be discussed in this chapter include: (a) a discussion of each of the null
hypotheses; (b) the population surveyed; (c) the instrument and the rationale for their choice; (d)
the procedures and implementation; and (e) a data analysis.

Null Hypotheses

Based on the preceding literature review on transformational / transactional leadership
style and the research question, 24 null hypotheses were generated. They were evaluated based
on the transformational and transactional leadership style of ADs in general, as well as by NCAA
Division, age and gender. The hypotheses were stated in the null and will be tested at an alpha
level of $\leq .05$. According to Connolly (2007), T-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were
the appropriate statistical methods to utilize in the comparison of group means. The independent

samples t-test was used to compare two groups to determine if their means were likely to be different. In this study t-tests were used when gender was the independent variable for hypotheses 17-24. Connolly (2007) explained that while the independent sample t-test was limited to comparing the means of two groups, the one-way ANOVA could compare more than two groups. Thus a one-way ANOVA was used to test hypotheses 1-8 with the NCAA Division as the independent variable and hypotheses 9-16 with age as the independent variable (Connolly, 2007).

Ho1 = *There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participates and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) reflected transformational leadership style.* This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) as the dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 3 on the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 10, 18, 21, and 25 on the MLQ.

Ho2 = *There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) reflected transformational leadership style.* This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) as the dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 3 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 6, 14, 23 and 34 on the MLQ.

Ho3 = There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participateed and the degree to which an AD's score on Intellectual Stimulation (IS) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Idealized Intellectual Stimulation (IS) as the dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 3 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 2, 8, 30 and 32 on the MLQ.

Ho4 = There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Inspirational Motivation (IM) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Inspirational Motivation (IM) as the dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 3 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 9, 13, 26, and 36 on the MLQ.

Ho5 = There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Individualized Consideration (IC) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Individualized Consideration (IC) as the dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable

62

was associated with question 3 in the demographic / institutional survey dependent variable was tested through survey questions 15, 19, 29, and 31 on the MLQ.

Ho6 = There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Contingent Reward (CR) reflected transactional leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership dimension Contingent Reward (CR) as the dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 3 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 1, 11, 16, and 35 on the MLQ.

Ho7 = There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Active Management by Exception (AME) reflected transactional leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership dimension Active Management by Exception (AME) as the dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 3 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 4, 22, 24, and 27 on the MLQ.

Ho8 = There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Passive Management by Exception (PME) reflected transactional leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership dimension Passive Management by Exception (PME) as the

dependent variable and NCAA Division as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 3 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 3, 12, 17, and 20 on the MLQ.

Ho9 = There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) as the dependent variable and the age of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 10, 18, 21, and 25 on the MLQ.

Ho10 = There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) as the dependent variable and the age of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 6, 14, 23, and 34 on the MLQ.

Ho11 = There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Intellectual Stimulation (IS) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership

dimension Intellectual Stimulation (IS) as the dependent variable and the age of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 2, 8, 30, and 32 on the MLQ.

Ho12 = There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Inspirational Motivation (IM) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Inspirational Motivation (IM) as the dependent variable and the age of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 9, 13, 26, and 36 on the MLQ.

Ho13 = There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Individual Consideration (IC) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Individual Consideration (IC) as the dependent variable and the age of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 15, 19, 29, and 31on the MLQ.

Ho14 = There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Contingent Reward (CR) reflected transactional leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null hypothesis

65

that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership dimension

Contingent Reward (CR) as the dependent variable and the age of the AD as the independent

variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in the demographic /

institutional survey dependent variable was tested through survey questions 1, 11, 16, and 35 on

the MLQ.

Ho15 = There was no significant difference between the age of the degree to which an

AD's score on Active Management by Exception (AME) reflected transactional leadership style.

This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test the null

hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership

dimension Active Management by Exception (AME) as the dependent variable and the age of the

AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in the

demographic / institutional survey dependent variable was tested through survey questions 4, 22,

24, and 27 on the MLQ.

Ho16 = There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to

which an AD's score on Passive Management by Exception (PME) reflected transformational

leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA to test

the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership

dimension Passive Management by Exception (PME) as the dependent variable and the age of

the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 1 in

the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey

questions 3, 12, 17, and 20 on the MLQ.

Ho17 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree

to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) reflected transformational

66

leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 10, 18, 21, and 25 on the MLQ.

Ho18 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis will be tested using the standard method T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 6, 14, 23, and 34 on the MLQ.

H019 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Intellectual Stimulation (IS) reflected transformational leadership style and the gender of the AD. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method one way ANOVA and T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Intellectual Stimulation (IS) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 2, 8, 30, and 32 on the MLQ.

67

Ho20 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Inspirational Motivation (IM) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Inspirational Motivation (IM) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 9, 13, 26, and 36 on the MLQ.

Ho21 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Individual Consideration (IC) reflected transformational leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transformational leadership dimension Individual Consideration (IC) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 15, 19, 29, and 31 on the MLQ.

Ho22 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Contingent Reward (CR) reflected transactional leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership dimension Contingent Reward (CR) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional

survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 1, 11, 16, and 35 on the MLQ.

Ho23 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Active Management by Exception (AME) reflected transactional leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership dimension Active Management by Exception (AME) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 4, 22, 24, and 27 on the MLQ.

Ho24 = There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Passive Management by Exception (PME) reflected transactional leadership style. This hypothesis was tested using the standard method T-test - to test the null hypothesis that there was no significant difference between the transactional leadership dimension Passive Management by Exception (PME) as the dependent variable and the gender of the AD as the independent variable. The independent variable was associated with question 2 in the demographic / institutional survey and the dependent variable was tested through survey questions 3, 12, 17, and 20 on the MLQ.

Design of the Study

The design of this study involved survey research, in an endeavor to determine how the self-perceived leadership style of intercollegiate AD's related to the demographics and institutional characteristics of NCAA Division, gender, and age. The above listed hypotheses were tested using one-way ANOVA and independent t-tests to test the null hypotheses that there

was no significant difference between the dimension of transformational or transactional leadership and the three independent variable demographics of division, gender, and age.

Survey research was often used to examine and investigate the characteristics and behaviors of a particular population that was being studied (Salant & Dillman, 2003). Singleton and Straits (2005) further explained the benefits of survey research when they stated, "Among all approaches to social research, in fact, surveys offer the most effective means of social description; they can provide extraordinary detailed and precise information about large heterogeneous populations"(p. 226). Ary, Jacobs, and Razavich (2002) found that an advantage of survey research was that it allowed the researcher to gather a broad range of information from a large population and to collect data from real life situations. Standardized questions made measurement more precise by the enforcement of uniform definitions upon the participants. In this study, survey research was practically chosen, because it provided the ability to sample a large population in varying locations as it was administered from remote locations using mail, email or telephone.

Survey research was considered a form of descriptive quantitative research. According to Babbie (1989), descriptive research described data and characteristics about the population phenomenon being studied. Descriptive statistics could be useful for two purposes: (1) to provide basic information about variables in a dataset and (2) to highlight potential relationships between variables. Descriptive statistics described the data; however, they did not draw conclusions about the data.

Population

Because the entire population was being surveyed, a sample did not exist. The survey recipients were all NCAA AD's from Division I, II, and III on record for the 2009-2010

academic year. According to Singleton and Straits (2005), this type of research was called a census study because data was gathered on every member of the population. In general, sampling the entire population was usually impractical with respect to cost and time. However, the census form of surveying was used in this study because the researcher already had information on every member of the population and a web based survey allowed for contact with the target population in a timely manner.

The researcher obtained the names and email addresses from Dr. Laura Burton, University of Connecticut and Dr. John Peachey, University of Texas A&M. Dr. Burton and Dr. Peachey had previously studied NCAA intercollegiate athletics and graciously agreed to share the database for the purpose of this study. The database was then updated by the researcher and included necessary changes and ensured information was current.

Instrumentation

The study utilized the MLQ Short 5x as the primary instrumentation. In addition, demographic survey questions were added to the web based survey through Mind Garden. The researcher received permission to modify the MLQ in order to add additional questions to meet the parameters of this research design. The participants in this study completed the MLQ as a self-rating instrument. They evaluated how frequently, or to what degree, they believed that they engaged in specific dimensions of leadership behavior toward people that they have communication with while fulfilling their responsibilities as a NCAA AD. This study concentrated on the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership of the AD in relationship to the institutional characteristic of NCAA Division, and the personal demographics of age and gender.

The researcher's intention for the demographic section of the survey was to use descriptive statistics in order to establish characteristics of AD's. The primary demographic questions within the survey were those that provided the basic information about the population being studied. This demographic data was deemed relevant to the predominant characteristics of AD's in order to demonstrate population similarities and differences. Based upon previous research discussed in the literature review, this study concentrated on the demographics of NCAA Division, age, and gender.

Data Collection

Mind Garden was used as an independent publisher and administrator of psychological assessments and instruments. All communication and emails, through the web based survey, were administered through Mind Garden. An initial email was sent on March 19, 2012 to the NCAA ADs to introduce the researcher, the purpose of the study, and reason for their requested participation. The following week, the researcher sent the ADs a survey invitation with an attached link to the survey. Two weeks after the initial invitation email, a follow up email was sent to all non-respondents. The ADs were allowed to voluntarily participate or to decline to participate in the survey.

According to Salant and Dillman (2003), data collection procedures within descriptive survey research were numerous and divided by the method of data collection that was used in the investigation process. In this study the researcher used Internet based survey as the medium of collection. Time saving was a primary advantage to the use of web surveys (Singleton & Straits, 2005). Internet surveys allowed the researcher to use a sample from a broad geographic area, while avoiding costs associated with traditional mail survey methods (Gratton & Jones, 2004). According to Singleton and Straits (2005), the web-based survey promoted a quick response time

and reduced response bias by assuring anonymity. With the rapid growth of Internet, technology

has influenced so many different aspects of society, and survey research was no exception.

NCAA ADs were asked to score each item on a Likert scale from 1 to 5 (1=not at all,

2=once in a while, 3=sometimes, 4=fairly often, 5=frequently if not always) for their self-

assessment of leadership characteristics and behavior. When administered as part of an

individual interview, strict confidentiality was assured to the participant. The MLQ survey

questions can be found in Appendix A. These were obtained through Mind Garden within the

MLQ manual. In addition, these ADs were asked to answer additional demographic questions to

provide insight into relationships between variables related to this study.

MLQ – Validity and Reliability

The NCAA AD's leadership styles were measured by the 5x-short form MLQ (Multiple

Leadership Questionnaire) developed by Avolio and Bass (2004). For the past three decades, the

MLQ has been the most important method by which we were able to reliably distinguish highly

effective from ineffective leaders in research of military, government, educational,

manufacturing, high technology, church, correctional, hospital, and volunteer organizations

(Avolio & Bass, 1993; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1997). The instrument consisted of 45 items,

which used a 5-point Likert response scale. Response scores ranged from 4 if *Frequently, if not*

always is chosen to 0 if *Not at all* is chosen. The MLQ contained 36 leadership items with four

items per scale and nine outcome items. An example of this instrument was included in

Appendix A. Research studies that administered the MLQ as part of their instrumentation were

discussed in greater detail throughout chapter 2.

Survey authoring software packages and online survey services made online survey

research much easier and faster. Yet there were advantages and disadvantages associated with

conducting survey research online. Advantages included access to individuals in distant locations, the ability to reach difficult to contact participants, and the convenience of having automated data collection, which reduced researcher time and effort. Disadvantages of online survey research included uncertainty over the validity of the data and sampling issues, and concerns surrounding the design, implementation, and evaluation of an online survey (Nair & Adam, 2009).

Past research had reported both reliability and validity of the MLQ. Avolio and Bass (2004) tested the MLQ on over 2,000 respondents and showed that all of the transformational and transactional leadership levels that were included as measurements within the survey have good internal consistency reliability with Cronbach's alpha ranging from .74 to .94. The transformational leadership scale titles were described in Appendix B. Good internal consistency reliability was also found with Doherty and Danylchuck (1996) with a Cronbach's alpha ranging from .74 to .89, which also examined AD's. In these studies Cronbach's alpha was consistently larger than .70, the threshold recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). According to Ozaralli (2003), the MLQ "was considered the best validated measure of transformational and transactional leadership" (p. 338). The researcher was using the MLQ because it provided information needed to examine the leadership of NCAA ADs and the association of leadership dimensions as they related to demographic characteristics.

One of the main criticisms of the MLQ was the external validity concern that was aroused from a practical awareness that good leadership often follows from behaviors, which assimilate the dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership. Peachey and Burton (2011) addressed this concern by calculating a mean score for transformational leadership using the five dimensions of idealized influence – attributes, idealized influence – behavior, intellectual

stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration and a mean score for the three dimensions of transactional leadership including the dimensions of contingent reward, active management-by-exception, and passive management-by-exception. The internal consistency score and the ANOVAs indicated that the results were portrayed as they were intended.

Data Analysis

The data were collected and submitted to the standard procedures for analysis prescribed by the authors of the MLQ instrument. The raw data obtained from Mind Garden, through the use of the previously described instrumentation and data collection procedures, were converted by the researcher from Excel data to Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and then analyzed. Cronbach's alpha internal consistency measures were calculated on the scales to check their reliability. The dependent variables were the factors measured by the MLQ, and the independent variables included the demographic questions directly related to this study. In order to test the null hypotheses detailed above, t-tests and ANOVAs were used. Results were reported in chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Chapter 4 included the data and analyses from the executed quantitative research design detailed in Chapter 3. The chapter began with an overview of survey participants and concluded with a brief summary of substantive findings.

Participants

The participant pool consisted of 1,079 institutions within the NCAA, which includes 335 Division I member institutions, 302 Division II member institutions, and 442 Division III member institutions. Of the 1,079 ADs who were asked to participate in the survey, 96 responded which generated a response rate of 8.9%. Twenty-three (23) of the 335 AD participants from Division I member institutions responded, which provided a Division I response rate of 6.9%. From the Division II institutions, 24 of the 302 AD participants responded, yielding a response rate of 7.9%, and 49 of the 442 AD participants from Division III institutions responded, giving a response rate of 11.1%.

In addition to the institutional characteristic of NCAA Division, the survey participants were asked to provide demographic information of age and gender. Male ADs were spread throughout all three divisions; in contrast, the majority of female ADs were from Division III member institutions. In Division I and III, the majority of ADs fell within the age range of 45 – 64; however, it was noted that Division II ADs were more evenly distributed throughout all age groups. Participants' division breakdown by gender and age can be found in Table 1.

Additionally, 5 (5.2%) ADs self-reported from the age group of 25 - 34, which consisted of four males and one female. There were 17 (17.7%) respondents in the age group of 35-44, including 15 males and two females. In the age range from 45 – 54, 31(32.3%) responded including 24 males and seven females. In the 45 - 54 age group, there were 33 (34.4%) total

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Demographic	Division I	Division II	Division III
Gender			
Males	21	19	34
Females	2	5	15
Age Groups			
25-34	1	4	0
35-44	4	4	9
45-54	6	8	17
55-64	10	6	17
65 and up	2	2	6

respondents consisting of 22 males and 11 females. Ten (10.4%) respondents fell in the 65 and

older age group including nine males and one female. The majority of both male and female

ADs fell in the age range of 45 to 64. The age group of 25 - 34 held the lowest number of

respondents from both genders.

Although no in-depth analysis has been conducted, a number of smaller studies suggested

that response rates for e-mail and web-based surveys might not yet match those of other methods

(Mehta & Sivadas, 1995; Schaefer & Dillman, 1998; Sheehan & McMillan, 1999; Sheehan &

Totten, 1994; Weible & Wallace, 1998). Many researchers recognized that higher response rates

promised more accurate survey results (Aday 1996; Babbie 1990; Rea & Parker 1997). It should

be noted that there were some problems associated with e-mail responses. Some users may not

receive the e-mail or block unsolicited e-mails. Others may just delete the email. Some

sophisticated users may have programs that block entry or reply automatically. However, Visser,

Krosnick, Marquette and Curtin (1996) found that surveys with lower response rates generated

more accurate measurements than did surveys with higher response rates. Their study found that

a good representation of the overall population and the questionnaire contents and design were

greater contributors to the accuracy than a high or low response rate. Although this research

study received a low response rate, the respondents seemed a good representation of the total

population of ADs. The NCAA Division, age, and gender of the respondents very closely

matched the percentages of these categories to the total population.

Analysis of Data

The SPSS 20.0 was used to analyze the data. A one-way ANOVA was utilized to

investigate data in order to compare means and to determine if significant differences existed

regarding the independent variables of age and division and the dependent variables of

individualized influence - attributes, individualized influence - behaviors, inspirational

motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management by

exception – active, and management by exception - passive. T-tests were utilized to determine

any significant differences and compare means regarding the same dependent variables and the

independent variable of gender. An alpha level of $\leq$ .05 indicated the results were not found by

chance but due to the differences in population method factoring in NCAA Division, age, and

gender.

Null Hypothesis One

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD

participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa)

reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, the means were compared across NCAA Division. Means from each

of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=3.21, SD=.338), Division II

(M=3.05, SD=.532), and Division III (M=3.06, SD=.518).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Division on

transformational and transactional leadership key component of idealized influence – attributes

as it related to the AD's institutional NCAA division membership. The one-way ANOVA,

$F(2,93) \leq 0.947$, $p \leq 0.392$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the

groups, therefore H_01 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Two

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD

participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb)

reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, the means were compared across NCAA Division. Means from each of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=3.29, SD=0.504), Division II (M=3.08, SD=0.467), and Division III (M=3.22, SD=0.490).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Division on transformational leadership key component of idealized influence – behaviors as it related to the AD's institutional NCAA Division membership. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 1.152$, $p \leq 0.321$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore $H_0 2$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Three

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Intellectual Stimulation (IS) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey participants were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit intellectual stimulation, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across NCAA Divisions. Means from each of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=3.50, SD=0.367), Division II (M=3.01, SD=0.721), and Division III (M=3.23, SD=0.559).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Division on the transformational leadership key component of intellectual stimulation as it related to NCAA Division. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 3.521$, $p \leq 0.034$, demonstrated statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, $H_0 3$ was rejected.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the three groups indicated that the NCAA Division I group (M = 3.09, 95% CI [2.87, 3.31]) perceived themselves to display a higher level of intellectual stimulation than the Division II group (M = 2.74, 95% CI [2.59, 2.89], p = .029).

Null Hypothesis Four

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Inspirational Motivation (IM) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit inspirational motivation, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across NCAA Division. Means from each of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=3.50, SD=0.367), Division II (M=3.01, SD=0.721), and Division III (M=3.23, SD=0.559).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Division on transformational leadership key component of inspirational motivation as it related to NCAA Division. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 4.346$, $p \leq 0.016$, demonstrated statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, H_04 was rejected.

Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the three groups indicated that the NCAA Division I group (M = 3.50, 95% CI [3.34, 3.65]) perceived themselves to display a higher level of inspirational motivation than the Division II group (M = 3.01, 95% CI [2.70, 3.31], p = .011).

Null Hypothesis Five

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Individualized Consideration (IC) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit individual consideration, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across NCAA Divisions. Means from each of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=3.12, SD=0.847), Division II (M=3.02, SD=0.454), and Division III (M=3.14, SD=0.452).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Division on transformational leadership key component of individual consideration as it related to NCAA Division. The one-way ANOVA, $F(1,96) \leq 0.385$, $p \leq 0.682$ demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, H_05 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Six

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Contingent Reward (CR) reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit contingent reward, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across NCAA Divisions. Means from each of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=3.09, SD=0.810), Division II (M=2.92, SD=0.767), and Division III (M=2.75, SD=0.827)

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Division on transactional leadership key component of contingent reward as it related to NCAA Division. The one-way ANOVA, $F(1,96) \leq 1.431$, $p \leq 0.244$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, H_06 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Seven

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD

participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Active Management by Exception (AME)

reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what

degree they perceived themselves to exhibit management by exception - active, a key component

of transactional leadership. The means were compared across NCAA Division. Means from

each of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=1.62, SD=0.984), Division II

(M=1.46, SD=1.038), and Division III (M=1.28, SD=0.690)

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Division on

transactional leadership key component of management by exception - active as it related to

NCAA Divisions. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 1.272$, $p \leq 0.285$, demonstrated no

statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, $H_0 7$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Eight

There was no significant difference between the NCAA Division in which the AD

participated and the degree to which an AD's score on Passive Management by Exception

(PME) reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what

degree they perceived themselves to exhibit management by exception - passive, a key

component of transactional leadership. The means were compared across NCAA Division.

Means from each of the NCAA Divisions appeared to be similar: Division I (M=0.861,

SD=0.500), Division II (M=0.992, SD=0.569), and Division III (M=0.798, SD=0.604)

83

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA Divisions on transactional leadership key component of management by exception - passive as it related to NCAA Divisions. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 0.923$, $p \leq 0.401$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, $H_0 8$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Nine

There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit individualized influence - attributes, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the AD participants. Means from each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=3.28, SD=0.396), 35-44 (M=3.13, SD=0.577), 45-54 (M=3.00, SD=0.372), 55-64 (M=3.11, SD=0.523), and 65 and older (M=3.17, SD=0.570).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on transformational leadership key component of individualized influence - attributes as it related to the age of the AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 0.576$, $p \leq 0.681$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, $H_0 17$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Ten

There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit individualized influence - behaviors, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the

84

AD participants. Means from each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=3.02, SD=0.455), 35-44 (M=3.20, SD=0.483), 45-54 (M=3.07, SD=0.517), 55-64 (M=3.29, SD=0.495), and 65 and older (M=3.38, SD=0.333).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on transformational leadership key component of individualized influence - behaviors as it related to the age of the AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 1.367$, $p \leq 0.252$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore, $H_0 18$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Eleven

There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Intellectual Stimulation (IS) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit intellectual stimulation, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the AD participants. Means from each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=2.72, SD=0.311), 35-44 (M=2.89, SD=0.351), 45-54 (M=2.83, SD=0.550), 55-64 (M=3.07, SD=0.491), and 65 and older (M=3.03, SD=0.313).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on transformational leadership key component of intellectual stimulation as it related to the age of the AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(1,96) \leq 1.418$, $p \leq 0.234$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore $H_0 19$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Twelve

There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Inspirational Motivation (IM) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit inspirational motivation, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the AD participants. Means from each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=3.12, SD=0.572), 35-44 (M=3.07, SD=0.801), 45-54 (M=3.12, SD=0.559), 55-64 (M=3.42, SD=0.496), and 65 and older (M=3.36, SD=0.433).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on transformational leadership key component of inspirational motivation as it related to the age of the AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(1,96) \leq 1.643$, $p \leq 0.170$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore H_020 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Thirteen

There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Individual Consideration (IC) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit individual consideration, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the AD participants. Means from each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=2.90, SD=0.224), 35-44 (M=2.95, SD=0.424), 45-54 (M=3.04, SD=0.514), 55-64 (M=3.20, SD=0.713), and 65 and older (M=3.40, SD=0.394).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on the transformational leadership key component of individual consideration as it related to the age of the AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(1,96) \leq 1.523$, $p \leq 0.202$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore H_021 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Fourteen

There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an

AD's score on Contingent Reward (CR) reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what

degree they perceived themselves to exhibit contingent reward, a key component of transactional

leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the AD participants. Means from

each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=2.72, SD=0.415), 35-44 (M=2.89,

SD=0.408), 45-54 (M=2.67, SD=1.00), 55-64 (M=3.11, SD=0.714), and 65 and older (M=2.77,

SD=1.03).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on

transactional leadership key component of contingent reward as it related to the age group of the

AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(2,93) \leq 1.315$, $p \leq 0.270$, demonstrated no statistically

significant differences among the groups, therefore $H_0 22$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Fifteen

There was no significant difference between the age of the degree to which an AD's score

on Active Management by Exception (AME) reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what

degree they perceived themselves to exhibit management by exception - active, a key component

of transactional leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the AD participants.

Means from each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=1.66, SD=1.00), 35-44

(M=1.81, SD=0.636), 45-54 (M=1.46, SD=0.846), 55-64 (M=1.17, SD=0.900), and 65 and older

(M=1.12, SD=0.924).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on transactional leadership key component of management by exception - active as it related to the age of the AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(1,96) \leq 1.841$, $p \leq 0.128$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences between the groups, therefore H_023 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Sixteen

There was no significant difference between the age of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Passive Management by Exception (PME) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit management by exception - passive, a key component of transactional leadership. The means were compared across age groups of the AD participants. Means from each of the age groups appeared to be similar: 25-34 (M=1.16, SD=0.673), 35-44 (M=0.682, SD=0.626), 45-54 (M=0.897, SD=0.448), 55-64 (M=0.939, SD=0.609), and 65 and older (M=0.650, SD=0.617).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the impact of NCAA AD age on transactional leadership key component of management by exception - passive as it related to the age of the AD participant. The one-way ANOVA, $F(1,96) \leq 1.298$, $p \leq 0.277$, demonstrated no statistically significant differences among the groups, therefore H_024 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Seventeen

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Attributes (IIa) reflected transformational leadership style.

88

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit idealized influence - attributes, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = 3.09; SD = 0.452) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = 3.11; SD = 0.596) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on idealized influence – attributes was not statistically significant (t=-0.191, $p \leq 0.849$). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, $H_0 9$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Eighteen

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Idealized Influence – Behaviors (IIb) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit idealized influence - behaviors, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = 3.17; SD = 0.479) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = 3.30; SD = 0.520) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on idealized influence – behaviors was not statistically significant (t =-1.121, $p \leq$ 0.265). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, $H_0 10$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Nineteen

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Intellectual Stimulation (IS) reflected transformational leadership style and the gender of the AD.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit intellectual stimulation, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = 2.93; SD = 0.456) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = 2.97; SD = 0.538) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on intellectual stimulation was not statistically significant (t =-.333, p =.740). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, $H_0 11$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Twenty

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Inspirational Motivation (IM) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit inspirational motivation, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = 3.25; SD = 0.571) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = 3.21; SD = 0.652) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on inspirational motivation was not statistically significant (t =0.267, $p \leq 0.790$). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, $H_0 12$ was retained.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-one

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Individual Consideration (IC) reflected transformational leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit individual consideration, a key component of transformational leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = 3.09; SD = 0.591) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = 3.18; SD = 0.487) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on individual consideration was not statistically significant ($t = -0.657$, $p \leq 0.513$). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, H_013 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-two

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Contingent Reward (CR) reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit contingent reward, a key component of transactional leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = 2.88; SD = 0.813) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = 2.84; SD = 0.828) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on contingent reward was not statistically significant ($t = 0.216$, $p \leq 0.829$). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, H_014 was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-three

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Active Management by Exception (AME) reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit management by exception - active, a key component

of transactional leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = 1.37; SD = 0.877) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = 1.53; SD = 0.824) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on management by exception - active was not statistically significant (t = -0.747, $p \leq 0.457$). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, $H_0 15$ was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis Twenty-four

There was no significant difference between the gender of the AD and the degree to which an AD's score on Passive Management by Exception (PME) reflected transactional leadership style.

For this hypothesis, survey respondents were asked questions that signified to what degree they perceived themselves to exhibit management by exception - passive, a key component of transactional leadership. The means were compared between the male and female gender. An independent samples t-test showed that the scores of the male ADs (N = 74; M = .878; SD = 0.588) and the female ADs (N = 22; M = .805; SD = 0.524) were similar. The interaction and effect of gender on management by exception - passive was not statistically significant (t = 0.530, $p \leq 0.598$). Given that there were no statistically significant differences, $H_0 16$ was not rejected.

<div align="center">

Summary

</div>

This research study sought data to indicate the existence of a relationship between the self-perceived AD leadership style and demographic and divisional characteristics in intercollegiate athletics. A relationship between the leadership styles of ADs would be indicated by leadership style variances and by the institutional characteristic of NCAA Division and the

demographic characteristics of age and gender. Twenty-four null hypotheses based one overarching research question were explored.

The research question examined considered to what degree if any NCAA ADs perceived themselves to demonstrate more or less transformational and transactional leadership dimensions. In addition to this overarching research question, there were three components that were examined. The first component studied, considered to what degree if any the NCAA Division category of the AD would create a significant difference in the self-perception of their leadership style as it specifically related to the eight dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership. Hypotheses one through eight addressed this component of the research question. Using one-way ANOVAs, statistically significant differences were found regarding the transformational leadership components of intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation. Post Hoc multiple comparisons using Tukey HSD indicated in both significant differences that Division I ADs perceived themselves to exhibit higher levels of both intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation than Division II ADs. There were no significant differences that related to Division III.

The second extension to the research question considered to what degree if any the age of the AD would create a significant difference in the self-perception of their leadership style as it specifically related to the eight dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership. Hypotheses 9 through 16 addressed this component of the research question. Using one-way ANOVAs, no significant differences were found, which indicated that age was not related to self-perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership indicators. Nevertheless, although no statistically significant differences were found, it was noted that the means for inspirational motivation and individual consideration, key components of transformational

93

leadership, increased with age. This trend was noted in the research and could potentially be fleshed out greater with a large sample population.

The third component considered to what degree if any the gender of the AD would create a significant difference in the self-perception of their leadership style as it specifically related to the eight dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership. Hypotheses 17 through 24 addressed this component to the research question. T-tests were used to compare how males and females exhibited key components of transformational and transactional leadership. There were no significant differences found, which indicated that gender was not a statistically significant factor in the self-perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership indicators. Implications of the results were detailed in chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Previous chapters introduce this study, provide research and literature on the topics of the study being conducted, outline the methodology used in this research, and provide the results of the survey administration. This chapter includes a summary of the findings, discussions of the outcomes, and an interpretation of the results. Review of the research questions, discussion of the findings and trends, implications for practice, and analysis of the limitations associated with this study are provided in this chapter. The conclusions include recommendations for future researchers interested in transformational / transactional leadership within the realm of intercollegiate athletics.

Leadership Style and NCAA Divisions

The present study is guided by one overarching research question that inquires into the self-perceived leadership style of NCAA athletic directors (ADs) as it specifically relates to transformational / transactional leadership traits. There are three sub-research questions derived from the overarching research question that includes the characteristics of NCAA Division, age, and gender.

Findings

According to findings in chapter 4, Division I ADs believe themselves to utilize more transformational traits than do ADs from Division II and Division III. Specifically, the researcher finds that the transformational leadership traits of intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation set Division I ADs apart from ADs within Divisions II and III. In order to clarify this connection, it is important to understand the trends between the transformational traits of intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation and the roles and responsibilities of

a Division I AD. By contrast, there are no statistically significant differences by age or gender.

Implications for these non-findings are discussed subsequent to the NCAA divisional divide.

Intellectual Stimulation

Bass (2004) describes intellectual stimulation as the ability of a leader to keep those

following him or her thinking about the task at hand, asking questions, and solving problems.

Division I ADs generally delegated task-oriented operations, while they focus on strategic

planning, budgeting, and overall development of the athletic programs. By contrast, Division II

and III ADs often is not equipped with the staff size or budget to delegate managerial tasks.

The gap between Division I and the other two divisions is not unnoticed. While speaking

to university presidents at the Final Four on March 29, 2012, NCAA president Mark Emmert

says that he wants to construct a committee to look at the possibility of changing the

accountability model to address the growing gap between Division I schools and the rest of the

NCAA membership. Consistent with their growth in college football and basketball programs,

Division I universities are seeing significant revenue gains, earning millions of dollars more than

smaller institutions. The gap between smaller and larger athletic departments within the NCAA

have widened significantly. Members of Division I are committed to participating in

professional college sports. Therefore, it is essential that the Division I AD has a competent staff

in which to delegate responsibilities. The difference in Division I ADs' supervisory

responsibility is that given their vast amount of obligations, they supervise on a macro level

versus Division II and III that manage their athletic department with a more hands on approach.

Both Division II and III athletic departments, tends to be understaffed, especially in comparison

to Division I, with individuals that perform multiple tasks. Task oriented jobs require a greater

amount of transactional leadership. As such, Division I ADs are in fact freer to focus on broader

visioning, institutional policy, practices, and strategic development. In those instances it seems

reasonable to think that Division I ADs believe themselves to display stronger intellectual

stimulation traits than ADs in Divisions II and III. A leader that is able to intellectually stimulate

their staff works to cultivate the talents of his group and, in turn, graciously accepts their support.

Inspirational Motivation

The ADs' ability as a leader to provide meaning and context to the entire athletic

department in order to promote a common mission is referred to as inspirational motivation.

Fulks (2003) explains that Division I ADs are responsible for not only oversight of the everyday

operations of the institution's athletic department, but also for winning records, massive financial

budgets, and greater institutional pressures to succeed. Although the AD is directly accountable

for the success of the athletic department, it is not a one-person job and therefore it is vital that

the AD be able to motivate and obtain the support of the entire department in order to succeed.

Division I ADs are responsible for providing leadership that sustains a strong commitment to an

inclusive environment and that serves the needs of student athletes, coaches, staff, university

administration, and the public. Whereas Division II and III shares some of the same

responsibilities, they operate with a much smaller budget and in a less public environment.

Divisional Inequities

One theme that is noted in the research that is consistent throughout literature on NCAA

divisional inequalities is that due to the scope and complexity of intercollegiate athletics, the

roles and responsibilities of ADs differs dramatically across NCAA Divisions. Peachey and

Burton (2011) and Burton and Peachey (2009) have found no evidence to indicate a divisional

impact on NCAA ADs' leadership style, which is contrary to the findings of this research.

However, it is important to recognize one similarity among the studies which is that ADs across

divisions know the difference between transactional and transformational leadership. However, Division I ADs have the opportunity, given their vast job responsibilities, to exercise a more transformational style of leadership. In order to explain the difference in size between the divisions, it is important to understand the leadership style essential for Division I ADs. At the other end of the continuum is Division III, where financial aid based on athletic ability is forbidden, and athletic departments are considered the same as any other department within the institution. Division II is middle ground, where minimum requirements for participation and scheduling are more stringent than Division III, and scholarships for athletic capability are available, the limits to those awards are lower than in Division I (NCAA, 2012). NCAA ADs earn a median $98,086 for the 2010 to 2011 school year. Yet, there are nine Division I ADs that made more than $1,000,000 that same academic year. The inequality in the size of athletic departments thus, the differences in the roles and responsibilities of the AD, provides a reasonable explanation for the variances in self-perceived transformational and transactional leadership style between NCAA Divisions.

Leadership Style and Age

The research from this study suggest a marginal, non-significant trend that as the age of the NCAA AD increases, the more transformational dimensions they believe are demonstrated in their leadership style. Dunderstadt (2000) explains that both inspirational motivation and individual consideration are key components of transformational leadership that benefit the AD by communicating and motivating people towards a common overall mission and therefore, inspire growth. Doherty (1997) has found that younger ADs are perceived to exhibit transformational leadership traits to a greater degree than does older ADs. However, Kabacoff and Kakabadse (1999) contends that research in which age is examined in relationship to

transformational leadership is inconclusive. Overall, the majority of literature that relates to age and leadership style falls into one of two arguments. One argument is that older leaders tend to be more rigid and therefore, less likely to exhibit transformational leadership traits. In contrast, other researchers argue that as a result of years of experience, older leaders are more inclined to anticipate issues and to respond with confidence with a higher level of maturity and wisdom.

This research study notes specifically that the perceived use of the transformational leadership traits of inspirational motivation and individual consideration does increase with age. According to Bass (2004), inspirational motivation involves being able to openly articulate the institution's mission and vision for the future to a variety of audiences and persuading participation towards a common goal and mission. Both maturity and experience that generally come along with the age of the AD are important in being able to distinguish between a leader and a manager. A mature leader is generally a constructive person who has experienced the various development phases. A strong leader is able to articulate clear goals and create realistic expectations for their staff. A mature leader also recognizes the value and the difference between his or her job responsibilities and those of various staff positions. Therefore, a mature leader is able to gain the respect of the staff and inspire motivation throughout the department. Many older ADs who have maintained an active interest in intercollegiate athletics for many years are able to draw on an accumulation of personal knowledge and experience, which is not a part of the background of the younger AD.

Division may confound the age factor in this study, as the average age of Division I participants are greater than those from Division II and Division III. As mentioned before, organizational growth is a primary focus for Division I ADs, where Division II and III dealt more with the everyday operations of the athletic department. Therefore, it seems appropriate

that as the age of the AD increases, the degree to which the AD uses transformational leadership also increases. Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that in the intercollegiate athletic environment there could be a connection between the divisional findings and the trend that is noted with age. This finding is natural given that Division I ADs often begin their careers in venues other than Division I schools, proving themselves professionally able over time.

Leadership Style and Gender

The outcomes from this study indicates that gender did not impact the ADs self-perception of their own leadership style, which is in contrast to the stereotypical gender roles found in the majority of literature on transformational and transactional leadership. Doherty (1997) contends that female ADs demonstrate transformational leadership traits more often than does male ADs. This is also consistent with the majority of literature that examines gender as a dynamic of transformational and transactional leadership. Traditionally, transformational leadership is found to be more congruent with a stereotypical feminine gender role, whereas, transactional leadership is associated more with a masculine gender role (Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Powell, 1993; Powell et al., 2008). Conversely, the results of this research are consistent with Peachey and Burton (2011) and Burton and Peachey (2009) which indicate that gender does not have an influence on the transformational and transactional leadership style of the AD. It is apparent through this study that ADs are a group in which their roles, responsibilities, and environment set them apart in a "class of their own", where gender does not play a factor in transformational and transactional leadership style. Burton and Peachey (2009) shows that transformational leadership of the AD is positively associated with stimulating extra effort and satisfaction with the leader and that transformational leadership is preferred overall, regardless of whether a woman or man is exhibiting this style of leadership.

100

Implications for Practice

The self-perceived perspective of transformational and transactional leadership can provide additional insight and direction for university administrators in determining which leadership traits will work best with the size, environment, and vision of the individual athletic department. It is important for intercollegiate ADs to recognize that both transactional and transformational leadership behaviors can be the basis for effective leadership of athletic departments and that both leadership behaviors can be valuable depending on the context and responsibilities at a given point in time. With an increased understanding of their own leadership style, the AD can balance between both leadership styles depending on a specific task or role. For example, an AD might choose a different leadership behavior when developing a budget versus if they are networking at a community event to raise funds for the athletic department. Since budgets are much more detailed and task oriented, transactional traits can be used by the AD in order to balance the wants and needs of the various programs within the athletic department.

The communication and leadership of the AD is essential in order to create motivation that encourages the entire athletic department to strive to meet the demands of the institution's NCAA divisional level of accountability. The relationship between the intercollegiate AD and the overall administration of the college or university is important in connecting the athletic department to the university as a whole. For example, given the effect that intercollegiate presidents can have on the employment status of their ADs, it will be helpful in both retention and job satisfaction of the ADs if they are aware of their own leadership style in relationship to the president's leadership style. This can help to improve the communication and provide the

AD with a clearer understanding of expectations and responsibilities that are placed on the intercollegiate athletic administration.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study can also serve as a foundation for future research studies in the area of self-perceived leadership style of higher education administrators. One suggestion is to use a longitudinal approach, namely data collection taking place at different time intervals. This will be beneficial given that transformational leadership shows a trend of increasing with age. This direction can lead to stronger findings of the relationship between age and the dimensions of transformational / transactional leadership. Another recommendation includes conducting telephone and face-to-face interviews on a random sample of the NCAA intercollegiate AD population, which can provide a different dynamic into self-perceived leadership styles of the ADs. An additional approach will be to use a random sample within one specified NCAA Division in order to lessen the divisional gap that is discussed earlier in this chapter.

While co-relational studies may suggest that there is a relationship between two variables, they cannot prove that one variable causes a change in another variable. An additional suggestion is to utilize quantitative measures in future research by developing and implementing a scale for rating and ranking the themes and responses that are solicited in the current investigation. This can allow for further explanation and reasoning for the relationship between the independent variables and transformational leadership.

Another direction worth consideration throughout transformational leadership research is outcomes that indicate the success of the athletic department. Examples of such outcomes might include, but are not limited to, turnover rates, staff job satisfaction, athlete graduation rates, and winning records within individual athletic programs. This study can guide future research

studies to examine outcomes as they relate to self-perceived transformational / transactional leadership style. There has been research on Bass's Transformational Leadership Theory as it relates to organizational outcomes; however, this study presents a new direction that can be used to investigate those outcomes on the basis of self-awareness.

Further research is needed in the examination of leadership styles of NCAA ADs within a less diverse population. For example, a research study can investigate the self-perceived leadership style using the population of just Division I-A ADs. Another suggestion will be to divide one NCAA division into groups based on revenue; therefore, it will be less of a gap between the top and bottom of the population. This can increase the chance of demographics such as age and gender having a significant impact of leadership style.

<p align="center">**Limitations of the Study**</p>

The research study makes important theoretical contributions to our understanding of the self-perceived transformational and transactional leadership of NCAA ADs and the effects of NCAA Division, age, and gender. However, there are limitations to this study. First, the research study has a very low response rate of just 8.9% (6.9% for Division I, 7.9% for Division II, 11.1% for Division III). Therefore, the possibility exists that those ADs who do not respond to the survey may hold different perceptions than those represented in the study. Therefore, the findings may not be a representative of all intercollegiate ADs.

There is a possibility that the findings are influenced by another variable within the study or by other variables outside of the research design. For example, the research indicates that NCAA Division I ADs believe themselves to demonstrate a higher degree of transformational leadership. However, it is possible that this finding can be influenced by the age and experience

<p align="center">103</p>

of Division I ADs in comparison to Division II and III. In other words, correlation does not equal causation.

Additional limitations exist by the use of a self-reporting survey. The survey participants are asked to complete the MLQ-5x Leader Form, which has a restricted range of responses. Self-reporting can only provide information about past or likely actions. Responses cannot describe how people will actually act in a given situation. Self-perceptions were not necessarily consistent with reality. The perceptions one has of their own leadership style may vary from the perceptions others may have of their leadership style. Therefore, these findings may not represent an accurate reflection of ADs leadership behaviors.

Summary and Conclusion

In intercollegiate athletic administration, transformational leadership is essential for success. As ethical scandals increase, along with the need to do more with less, colleges and universities are looking for leaders able to transform and inspire individuals to act in the institution's best interests. Consider the University of Michigan's AD choice, when they named Domino's Pizza CEO, David Brandon, as their AD for his admirable leadership skills, business expertise, long-term involvement with the university, and personal consideration and knowledge of the challenges and rewards of being a student athlete. His management philosophy combines operational discipline with individual consideration for all stakeholders. Domino's flourishes under Brandon's tenure, and he is well liked by employees. While it is hopeful that all ADs are responsible for demonstrating individual consideration in the supervision of coaches and athletic department personnel, as well as for fostering an environment of success within the department, this is of particular importance in the Division I context.

104

In this study, the researcher finds that Division I ADs considered themselves to demonstrate a stronger degree of transformational leadership traits than Division II and III ADs. In addition, a direct, but not significant, correlation is noted between the age of the NCAA AD and the degree that the ADs consider themselves to display transformational leadership traits. This trend parallels literature on the impact of age on transformational leadership. It is noted in the research that gender does not have an impact, which goes against the majority of literature on the impact of gender on transformational leadership. However, it is aligned with the recent research of Peachey and Burton (2011) that deals with transformational leadership within the context of intercollegiate athletics.

In putting the findings and trends of this study in context, it is important to understand the diversity in roles and responsibilities between NCAA divisions. The differences create a need for an assorted range of leadership traits that balance between transformational and transactional leadership styles. While intercollegiate athletic administration and transformational leadership styles have both received substantial attention from scholars, little previous research has been conducted in the self-awareness and perception of leadership styles. The findings and trends reveal that the transformational and transactional leadership traits as perceived by the ADs seem to be primarily in line with their overall roles and responsibilities that are dictated by the NCAA divisional membership.

In conclusion, transformational / transactional leadership research will continue to be a priority in the intercollegiate athletic setting, as it is throughout higher education administration. Presently, the conclusions that are reached through research in this area were unclear and, in some cases, contradictory. However, as the research in this area continues, a clearer understanding will form of the role of leadership and its impact on NCAA ADs.

REFERENCES

Acosta, R., & Carpenter, L. (2004). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study –Twenty-seven year update.* Retrieved from http://webpages.charter.net/womeninsport/AcostaCarp_2004.pdf

Aguirre, A., & Martinez, R. (2002). Leadership practices and diversity in higher education: Transitional and transformational frameworks. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 8*, 53-62.

Altbach, P. (2006). What's in a name? For a million bucks or so, you can name that school. *Academe, 92*(1), 46-47.

Andre, P., & James, D. (1991). *Rethinking college athletics.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 261-295.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A*.,* & Einstein, W. O. (1988). Transformational leadership in a management game simulation: Impacting the bottom line. *Group and Organizational Studies, 13,* 59–80.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire, manual and sampler.* Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Sampler set* (3rd ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *17*(2), 112.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Transformational Leadership, charisma and beyond. *Emerging Leadership Vistas.* Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

Avolio, B. J., Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). Identifying common methods variance with data collected from a single source: An unresolved sticky issue. *Journal of Management, 17*, 571-587.

Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & Einstein, W. O. (1987). Transformational leadership in a management game simulation. *Group & Organizational Studies, 13*, 59-80.

Barling, J., Loughlin, C., & Kelloway, E. (2002). Development and test of a model linking safety-specific transformational leadership and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 488-496.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*(6), 827-832.

Bass, B., Avolio, B., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45*(1), 5-34.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1990). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. *Leadership Theory and Research Perspectives and Directions*, 49-80.

Bass, B. M. (1981). *"Women and leadership", in Ralph Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership.
European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, *8*(1), 9.

Bass, B. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial
application*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Bass, B. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend
organizational and national boundaries? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52*(2), 130-139.

Bass, B. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact.*
Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bass, B., & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erbaum
Associates.

Bennis, W. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). *Images of leadership. An Occasional Paper, 7*. Nashville, TN:
Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional
leadership: A meta-analysis, *Journal of applied Psychology, 89*(5), 901-910.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Burns,T., Stalker, G., Lawrence, & Lorsch (2011). *The management of innovation*. London:
Tavistock.

Burden,W., & Li, M. (2003). Differentiation of NCAA Division I athletic departments in
outsourcing of sport marketing operations: A discriminant analysis of financial-related
institutional variables. *International Sports Journal, 7*(2), 74-81.

Burton, L. J., & Peachey, J. W. (2009). Transactional or transformational? Leadership

    preferences of Division III athletic administrators. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport,*

    2, 245-259.

Bycio, P., Hackett, R., & Allen, J. (1995), Further assessments of Bass's (1985)

    conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership, *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology 80, 468–478.

Cascio, C. (1995). National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: Changing teaching

    through teachers. *The Clearing House, 68*(4), 211-213.

Charbonneau, D., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001), Transformational leadership and sports

    performance: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Social*

    Psychology, 31, 1521–1534.

Choi, J. (2007).The relationship among transformational leadership, organizational outcomes,

    and service quality in the five major NCAA conferences. (doctoral dissertation). Available

    from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3270720)

Choi, J., Sagas, M., Park, S., & Cunningham, G. B. (2007). Transformational leadership in

    collegiate coaching: The effects of transformational leadership on job satisfaction,

    organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior. *International*

    Journal of Sport Management, 8, 429–445.

Connolly, P. (2007). *Quantitative data analysis in education*. New York, NY: Routledge

    Publishing, Inc.

Danylchuk, K., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). The nature of managerial work in Canadian

    intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 13*, 148-166.

Day, D. (2000). Leadership development: A review in context. *Leadership Quarterly, 11*(4), 581-613

De Cremer, D., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2002). How do leaders promote cooperation? The effects of charisma and procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(5), 858-866.

DeGroot, T., Kiker, D. S., & Cross, T. C. (2000). A meta-analysis to review organizational outcomes related to charismatic leadership. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *17*, 356–371.

Denhart, M., Villwock, R., & Vedder, R. (2009). *The academics athletics trade-off: Universities and intercollegiate athletics*. Washington, DC: Center for College Affordability and Productivity.

Dessler, G. (2001). *Management leading people in organizations in the 21st century*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Devanna, M. A., & Tichy, N. (1990). Creating the competitive organization of the 21st century: The boundaryless corporation. *Human Resource Management, 29*(4), 455-455.

Doherty, A. J. (1997). The effect of leader characteristics on the perceived transformational/transactional leadership and impact of interuniversity athletic administrators. *Journal of Sport Management, 11*, 275– 285.

Doherty, A. J., & Danylchuk, K. E. (1996). Transformational and transactional leadership in interuniversity athletic management. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 292–310.

Douthat, R. (2011). The devil and Joe Paterno. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/13/opinion/sunday/douthat-the-devil-and-joe-paterno.html?src=me&ref=general

Downton, J. (1973). Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in the revolutionary

process. *The Journal of Politics, 37*, 845-847.

Dumdum, U., Lowe, K., & Avolio, B. (2002). Meta analysis of transformational and

transactional leadership. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Ed.), *Transformational and

charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (pp. 35-66). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.

Dundon, J. (2008). Nonprofit and for-profit leaders in higher education: An analysis of the

differences in leadership dimensions. (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest

Dissertations and Theses.

Eagly, A. H., & Carli, L. L. (2003). Finding gender advantage and disadvantage: Systematic

research integration is the solution. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*,   851–859.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis.

Psychological Bulletin, *108*, 233–256.

Ellis, M. (2007). The bilateral dimensions of transformational leadership in selected university

constituents: An empirical study within the context of institutions of higher education.

(doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses.

Fizel, J., & Fort, R. (2004). *Economics of college sports.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Frank, R. H. (2004). Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletic

success, student quality, and donation. Knight Foundation Commission on

Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved from

http://www.knightcommission.org/about/white_papers/frank_report?

111

Fulks, D. L. (2003). Revenues and expenses, profits and losses of division I-A

 intercollegiate athletics programs aggregated by conference. Retrieved from

 http://www2.ncaa.org/media_and_events/ncaa_publications/ research/index.htm

Geist, A. L. (2001). Leadership and followership in NCAA Division II athletic directors.

 (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations and Theses. AAT 3011062.

Goff, B. (2000). Effects of university athletics on the university: A review and extension of

 empirical assessment. *Journal of Sport Management, 14*, 85-104.

Grant J. (1988), Women as managers: What they can offer to organizations. *Organizational*

 Dynamics, 4, 56-63.

Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2004). *Analyzing data II: Qualitative data analysis, Research*

 methods for sport studies. New York: Routledge.

Greenleaf, R., & Spear, L. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate*

 power and greatness. Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press.

Grimes, P., & Chressanthins, G. (1994). Alumni contributions to academics: The role of

 intercollegiate sports and NCAA sanctions. *American Journal of Economics and*

 Sociology, 53(1).

Hakwoo, K. (2009). Transformational and transactional leadership of athletic directors and their

 impact on organizational outcomes perceived by head coaches at NCAA Division II

 intercollegiate institutions. Retrieved from

 http://eastcarolina.summon.serialssolutions.com/search?s.q=Author%3A%22Hakwoo%22

Harrison, L., Li, W., & Solmon, M. (2004). College students' implicit theories of ability in

 sports: Race and gender differences. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 27*(3), 291-305.

112

Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinate perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 695-702.

Hernez-Broome, G., & Hughes, R. L. (2004). Leadership: Past, present, and future. *Human Resource Planning*, *27*(1), 24-32.

Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*(6), 891-902.

Kakabadse, A., Kakabadse, N., & Myers, A. (1998). Demographics and leadership philosophy: Exploring gender differences. *Journal of Management Development*, *17*(5), 351-88.

Kabacoff, R. I., & Stoffey, R.W. (2001). "Age differences in organizational leadership", paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.

Kearney, E., & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(1), 77-89.

Keller, R. T. (1992). Transformational leadership and the performance of research. *Journal of Management, 18*(3), 489-489.

Kelloway, K., Barling J., & Shah, A. (1993). Integrating domains of work stress and industrial relations: Evidence from five countries. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *14*(5), 447-457.

King, B. (2005b). Race for recruits*. Street & Smith's SportBusiness Journal, 8*(30), 19.

Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (1991). A new model for intercollegiate athletics.

Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2009). Knight Commission Poll finds

    Americans are concerned about college sports.

Kuchler, W. (2001). *The association of perceived leadership behaviors with subordinate job*

    satisfaction at selected NCAA Division III Midwest college athletic departments. (doctoral

    dissertation). AAT 3018411.

Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership, or how to succeed in business without being one of the*

    boys. New York, NY: Times Books.

Lowe, K. B.*,* & Kroeck, K. G. 1996. Effectiveness correlates of transformational and

    transactional leadership: A meta-analysis review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership*

    Quarterly, 7, 385–425.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of

    transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ

    literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385- 425.

Massimiliano, V. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A

    framework for analysis. *Higher Education, 48*(4), 483-510.

McCormick, R., & Tinsley, M. (1988). Athletics versus academics? Evidence from SAT Scores.

    Journal of Political Economy, 95, 1103-1116.

Murray, J. (1988). Commentary: Searching for leadership. *College Teaching, 36*(3), 90.

Nail, C., & Adams, P. (2009). Survey platform: A factor influencing online survey delivery and

    response rate. *Quality in Higher Education, 15*(3), 291-296.

National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. (2009). Profile of the National

    Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. Retrieved from

    http://nacda.collegesports.com

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011). History. Retrieved from

    http://www.ncaa.org/wps

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

    Publications.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychology theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Onnen, M. K. (1987). *The relationship of clergy leadership characteristics to growing or*

    declining churches. (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses: Full

    Text. (AAT 8809909).

Oshagbemi, T. (2004). Age influences on the leadership styles and behavior of managers.

    Employee Relations, 26(1), 14-29.

Parry, K., & Proctor-Thompson, S. (2003). Leadership culture and performance: The case of the

    New Zealand public sector. *Journal of Change Management, 3*(4), 376.

Paternoster, L. D. (2006). Transformational leadership and female community college presidents:

    A gender-focused assessment. (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations &

    Theses: Full Text.

Peachey, J. W., & Burton, L. J. (2011). Male of female athletic director? Exploring

    perceptions of leader effectiveness and a (potential) female leadership advantage with

    intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles, 64*, 416-425.

Pedersen, P., & Whisenant, W. (2005). Successful when given the opportunity: Investigating

    gender representation and success rates of interscholastic athletic directors. *The Physical*

    Educator. 62(1), 178.

Podsakoff, O., MacKensie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader

    behaviors and their effects on followers trust in leader satisfaction and organizational

    citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*(2), 107.

Powell, G.N. (1993). *Women and men in management* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage

    Publications.

Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Bartol, K. M. (2008). Leader evaluations: A new female

    advantage? *Gender in Management: An International Journal, 23*, 156-174.

Prati, L. M., Ceasar, D., Ferris, G. R., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2003). The role of

    emotional intelligence in team leadership: Reply to the critique by antonakis. *International*

    Journal of Organizational Analysis, 11(4), 363-363-369.

Raiborn, M. (1990). *Revenues and expenses of Divisions I and II intercollegiate athletic*

    programs: Financial trends and relationships – 1985-1989. Overland Park, KS: National

    Collegiate Athletic Association.

Riggio, R. E., Bass, B. M., & Orr, S. S. (2004). *Transformational leadership in nonprofit*

    organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Robinson, M. J., Tedrick, R., & Carpenter, J. R. (2001). Satisfaction of NCAA Division III

    athletic directors: A descriptive analysis and an examination of gender differences.

    International Sports Journal, 5(1), 25–32.

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review, 68*, 119-25.

Rowold, J. (2005). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire, psychometric properties of the German*

    translation. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.

Rozner, B. (2011). Want answers? Just follow the money at Penn State. *The Daily Herald*.

    Retrieved from: http://www.dailyherald.com/article/20111111/sports/711119907/

Ryska, T. A. (2002). Leadership styles and occupational stress among college athletic directors: The moderating effect of program goals. *The Journal of Psychology*, *132*(2), 195-219.

Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: Wiley.

Sartore, M. L., & Cunningham, G. B. (2007). Ideological gender beliefs, identity control and self-limiting behavior within sport organizations. *Quest, 59*, 244–265.

Schein, E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, D. K. (1997). Managing organizational culture in intercollegiate athletic organizations. *Quest, 49*, 403-415.

Scott, D. K. (1999). A multiframe perspective of leadership and organizational climate in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Management, 13*, 298-316.

Seidler, T. L., Gerdy, J. R., & Cardinal, B. J. (1998). Athletic director authority in Division I intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of athletic directors and college presidents. *International Sports Journal, 2*(2), 36-46.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.

Sheehan, R. (2000). The professionalization of college sports. *Higher Education in Transition: The Challenges of the New Millennium*, 133-158.

Shulman, J., & Bowen, W. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Sigelman, L., & Bookheimer, S. (1983). Is it whether you win or lose? Monetary Contributions to Big-Time College Athletic Programs. *Social Science Quarterly*, *64*(2), 347-359.

Singleton Jr., R. A., & Straits, B. C. (2005). *Approaches to social research* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: content and contextual comparison. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 80-92.

Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organizational Development, 25*(3/4), 349-359.

Suggs, W. (2003a). Conference soap opera is driven by cash, but cachet matters, too. Chronicle of Higher Education (May 30, 2003).

Suggs, W. (2003b). Cutting the field: As colleges eliminate teams, the lessons Athletes learn are losing out to commercial interests. Chronicle of Higher Education (Jun 6, 2003).

Suggs, W. (2004a). Bowl championship series signs deal with fox. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *51*(16).

Suggs, W. (2004b). Brawls, sex, and money: Another routine year in college sports. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *51*(17).

Suggs, W. (2004c). Colleges' expenditures on athletics can't be calculated, Panelists tell Knight Commission. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(11).

Suggs, W. (2004d). Football, television, and the supreme court. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *50*(44).

Suggs, W. (2005). Sports building boom is not proof of 'arms race,' report says. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 51*(36).

Tarabishy, A. (2005). The entrepreneurial leader's impact on the organization's performance in dynamic markets. *The Journal of Private Equity*, 20–29.

Thelin, J. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Torpman, J. (2004). The differentiating function of modern forms of leadership. *Management Decision*, *42*(7/8), 892-906.

Tucker, B., & Russell, R. (2004). The influence of the transformational leader. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 10*(4), 103-112.

Waldman, D. A., & Yammarino, F. (1999). CEO Char- ismatic Leadership: Levels-of- Management and Levels-of- Analysis Effects. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(2), 266-85.

Waldman, D. A., Bass, B. M., & Yammarino, F. J. (1990). Adding to contingent reward behavior: The augmenting effect of charismatic leadership. *Group and Organization Studies, 15*, 382-395.

Watkins, D. L., & Rikard, G. L. (1991). Perceptions of leader behaviors of athletic directors: Implications for change. *Physical Educator*, *48*.

Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1967). In Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. *University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center*, 1-119.

Whisenant, W., Pedersen, P., & Obenour, W. (2002). Success and gender: Determining the rate of advancement for intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 47* (9/10), 485-491.

Woods, T. J. (2007), Motivating faculty through transactional and transformational leadership strategies. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *1*, 64–73.

Yow, D., Migliore, R., Bowden, W., Stevens, R., & Loudon, D. (2000). *Strategic planning for collegiate athletics*. Binghamton, NY: The Hayworth Press.

Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Education.

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half-century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 15-32.

Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Yusof, A. (1998). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of athletic directors and coaches job satisfaction. *Physical Educator, 55*(4), 170-175.

Zacharatos, A., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. (2000). Development and effects of transformational leadership in adolescents. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*(2), 211-226.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

Part A-Sample MLQ Items & 5 Point Likert Scale

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, If not always
0	1	2	3	4

Intellectual Stimulation

MLQ Item Number 8. Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.

Idealized Influence (Behavior)

MLQ Item Number 14. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.

Contingent Reward

MLQ Item Number 1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for their efforts.

Management-by-exception (Active) MLQ Item Number 27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards.

Management-by-exception (Passive) MLQ Item Number 33. Delays responding to urgent questions.

Characteristic Scale Name	Survey Questions
Idealized Influence (Attributes)	10,18,21,25
Idealized Influence (Behaviors)	6,14,23,34
Inspirational Motivation	9,13,26,36
Intellectual Stimulation	2,8,30,32
Individual Consideration	15,19,29,31
Contingent Reward	1,11,16,35
Management by Exception (Active)	4,22,24,27
Passive Mgmt by Exception (Passive)	3,12,17,20

APPENDIX B: TRANSFORMATTIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLE TITLES

1. Idealized Influence (Attributed) – II (A) "Instills pride in being associated with him/her" Internal reliability coefficient of .86.

2. Idealized Influence (Behavior) – II (B) "Talks to us about his/her most important values and beliefs" Internal reliability coefficient of .87.

3. Inspirational Motivation – IM "Expresses his/her confidence that we will achieve our goals" Internal reliability coefficient of .91.

4. Intellectual Stimulation – IS "Emphasizes the value of questioning assumptions" Internal reliability coefficient of .90.

5. Individualized Consideration – IC "Treats me as an individual rather than just a member of a group" Internal reliability coefficient of .90.

Transactional Leadership Style Titles

6. Contingent Rewards – CR "Gives me what I want in exchange for my support" Internal reliability coefficient of .87.

7. Management-by-exception (Active) – MBEA "Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards" Internal reliability coefficient of .74.

8. Management-by-exception (Passive) – MBEP "Fails to intervene until problems become serious" Internal reliability coefficient of .82.

APPENDIX C: EMAIL INCLUDED WITH SURVEY

First Contact email

March 19, 2012

Dear *athletic director name:*

I need your help in order to graduate! My name is Laurie Manning. I am a doctoral student at East Carolina University. I am in the final stages of my dissertation research into NCAA athletic directors' perception of transformation / transactional leadership. I am using the Multivariate Leadership Questionnaire as an instrument to measure the self-perception of leadership style. In addition to the MLQ, you will be asked two demographic questions (Gender and Age) and one institutional question (Division). You have been identified as a NCAA athletic director and therefore, would meet the criteria for my research. I would be grateful if you would agree to participate in my study.

 The survey is located online by the link located in this email. The data will be downloaded from their server and analyzed by myself. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please be assured that your responses will remain strictly confidential. All data will be reported in aggregate and no individual information will be reported. The informed consent is online and explains the survey further. Please let me know if you have any questions. Feel free to call me at 252-269-1381.

Thank you again for your time.

Laurie Manning

Follow up email (This email will be sent one week after the original to provide a reminder)

March 26, 2012

Dear *athletic director name*:

Please help, I would like to graduate! My name is Laurie Manning. I am a graduate student at East Carolina University. I am doing research into NCAA athletic directors' perception of transformation / transactional leadership.

I recently sent you an invitation to complete a survey about leadership styles. I would like to again ask for you participation in this study.

Through my research, I am using the Multivariate Leadership Questionnaire as an instrument to measure the self-perception of leadership style. In addition to the MLQ, you will be asked two demographic questions (Gender and Age) and one institutional question (Division).

You have been identified as a NCAA athletic director who would meet the criteria for my research. I would be grateful if you would agree to participate in my study.

The survey is located online by the link located in this email. The data will be downloaded from their server and analyzed by myself. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please be assured that your responses will remain strictly confidential. All data will be reported in aggregate and no individual information will be reported.

The informed consent is online and explains the survey further. Please let me know if you have any questions. Feel free to call me at 252-269-1381.

Thank you again for your time.

Laurie Manning

124

APPENDIX D: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
University & Medical Center Institutional Review Board Office
1L-09 Brody Medical Sciences Building· Mail Stop 682
600 Moye Boulevard · Greenville, NC 27834
Office **252-744-2914**☏ · Fax **252-744-2284**☏ · www.ecu.edu/irb

Notification of Exempt Certification

From: Social/Behavioral IRB
To: Laurie Manning
CC:
          Michael Poock
Date: 3/6/2012
Re: UMCIRB 11-001359
          NCAA Athletic Directors' Self-Perspective of Transformational/Transactional Leadership

I am pleased to inform you that your research submission has been certified as exempt on 3/6/2012. This study is eligible for Exempt Certification under category #2.

It is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted in the manner reported in your application and/or protocol, as well as being consistent with the ethical principles of the Belmont Report and your profession.

This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are proposed changes to this study. Any change, prior to implementing that change, must be submitted to the UMCIRB for review and approval. The UMCIRB will determine if the change impacts the eligibility of the research for exempt status. If more substantive review is required, you will be notified within five business days.

The UMCIRB office will hold your exemption application for a period of five years from the date of this letter. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit an Exemption Certification request at least 30 days before the end of the five year period.

The Chairperson (or designee) does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

IRB00000705 East Carolina U IRB #1 (Biomedical) IORG0000418
IRB00003781 East Carolina U IRB #2 (Behavioral/SS) IORG0000418 IRB00004971
East Carolina U IRB #4 (Behavioral/SS Summer) IORG0000418